LORD ACTON
AND HIS CIRCLE

EDITED
BY ABBOT GASQUET

LORD ACTON & HIS CIRCLE

John D'Alberg, Lord Acton.

LORD ACTON AND HIS CIRCLE

Edited by

ABBOT GASQUET O.S.B.

GEORGE ALLEN
156 Charing Cross Rd
London

BURNS & OATES
28 Orchard Street
London

THE CONTENTS

Lord Acton and his Circle *Pages* ix-lxxxviij

Letters of Lord Acton

1. Lord Acton associated with Mr Richard Simpson in the management of the *Rambler*—Not to be the organ of any one school of thought—The true notion of a Christian State—Reviewing *Page* 1
2. Acton's attitude towards "converts"—Manning and Hope—Need of saying new and startling things— Foreign politics and English journals *Page* 8
3. Buckle's *History of Civilization*—Newman and the *Rambler* *Page* 11
4. Wiseman's *Last Four Popes*—*Rambler* article a special gratification to the Cardinal—Buckle's *History* superficial *Page* 12
5. Meeting of writers at Aldenham—Buckle to be "thoroughly shown up"—Dalgairns' pamphlet on *Mystics* *Page* 14
6. Desires a series of critical articles—Some subjects suggested *Page* 15
7. A journey to Paris—Buckle and the *Quarterly*—A French translation of Döllinger—Simpson's paper on Brownson—Gladstone on *Homer*—Meynell and his Bishop—Origen against Celsus *Page* 17
8. Simpson's article on Buckle—English philosophic systems—Carlyle—The Simancas papers about Mary Stuart *Page* 20
9. Donoso Cortès—Theology not a stationary science—New materials for the life of St Charles Borromeo—Healy Thompson's life of the saint *Page* 23
10. Dr Maguire on the *Analecta*—Merits of Jaffé's great work *Page* 26
11. Danger of dislike of prayer—A warning against intellectual contempt of fellow-Catholics—Döllinger's commonsense exposition of doctrine *Page* 29
12. Acton's paper on "Buckle"—Proposed union of the *Dublin* with the *Rambler*—The *Atlantis* *Page* 30
13. The editing and publishing of the *Dublin Review*—*Rambler* and *Dublin* to run together—Döllinger's visit to England *Page* 32
14. More negotiations for the *Dublin*—Dutch pamphlets at the Hague—A passage "likely to offend" *Page* 33
15. Döllinger in London—St Augustine—Simpson on Original Sin *Page* 34
16. Eckstein's paper on Guizot—"Combe's Phrenology" and "William Harrington"—Carlyle's *Frederick II of Prussia* *Page* 36
17. Döllinger on "The Paternity of Jansenism"—State of theological studies in England—Newman's approval *Page* 37
18. Union of the *Dublin* and the *Rambler* still discussed—Proposal that Newman shall have the direction—Simpson's letter to the Cardinal *Page* 38
19. Montalembert—Simpson's philosophy—A review of Carlyle *Page* 40
20. Montalembert's condemnation—Simpson on Whewell—Plan of uniting with the *Dublin* abandoned—Proposed "quartering" of the *Atlantis* *Page* 42

21. "Political Thoughts on the Church"—An article written in a hurry *Page* 43
22. Notes on Barrillon's embassy, 1596—Acton on "The Catholic Press" —Interviews with Wiseman and Newman—Newman's advice to avoid theological topics—His opinion as to Simpson's articles *Page* 45
23. A remarkable letter from Newman—Christianity and the separation of the political and religious orders—Concordats in the history of the Church —Newman's broad idea of the meaning of theology *Page* 48
24. Simpson's critique on Martineau—The Bible of Sixtus V corrected by Bellarmine—Simpson, Marshall and the *Saturday Review* *Page* 51
25. Aristotle on the supremacy of the law—Difficulties of controversy— Simpson's note upon Bright *Page* 53
26. Newman's design for the *Atlantis*—The German method of critical study —Newman's essay on St Cyril—Science valueless unless pursued without regard to consequences *Page* 54
27. Simpson on architecture—Gothic art a part of the Christian revival— Periodical literature not consistent with Acton's studies *Page* 57
28. Philosophers to criticize—The task of raising the level of thought—The only Catholic capable of conducting the *Rambler* *Page* 59
29. Montalembert's delight in the *Rambler*—Baron Eckstein—Lamennais and the Cardinalate—Döllinger pleased with progress in England *Page* 61
30. Newman as editor—Bishop Ullathorne's encouragement—Döllinger and the *Rambler*—Want of spirituality an obvious deficiency *Page* 62
31. Notes for Eckstein's article on Lamennais—Döllinger's Notes on Papal denunciations of Secret Societies—A note on Eckstein *Page* 64
32. A French attempt to secure the press—The censorship—Dissolution— Lord Granville wishes Acton to stand for Parliament *Page* 66
33. Simpson and the *Correspondant*—Campion—Secret Societies *Page* 68
34. Eckstein's "Lamennais"—Newman in great spirits about the *Rambler* *Page* 69
35. "Toleration"—A book by Thomassin—The historical aspect *Page* 72
36. F. de Buck in the *Rambler*—Articles from abroad to be rewritten *Page* 73
37. Simpson's translation of Eckstein—Newman advises the secularization of the *Rambler*—Criticism of Simpson's paper on "Whewell"—Newman's "episcopic work" for the *Rambler* *Page* 74
38. Father de Buck—Newman's "Ancient Saints" & "Northern Isles" *Page* 75
39. Austrian affairs *Page* 77
40. Newman's defence of Napoleon—Difficulty of the Roman Government after French occupation—The Pope and his Chamber *Page* 79
41. Newman advises acceptance of an article by Arnold on Mill's "Liberty" —St Augustine on "Toleration"—Acton's lost faith in Gladstone—Newman's infatuation about Napoleon *Page* 80
42. Simpson's letter on the composition of the Catholic body—Morris' Life of St Thomas *Page* 83
43. Newman's "Northern Isles"—An Austrian article—Visits to a military hospital—Protestants in Austria—A "Lingard Society" *Page* 84

The Contents

44. Newman's article on the Bonapartes—Projects for improving reviews of books—The Catholic University for Ireland *Page* 87
45. Lighter articles for the *Rambler*—Some ideas on "Bores" *Page* 104
46. A Venetian report on England—Signed correspondence—Was Charles I a Catholic?—Importance of not giving offence *Page* 108
47. The Code Napoléon—"The Political System of the Popes" *Page* 113
48. Acton's views as to "Temporal Power"—Dr Northcote—Newman's approval and criticism *Page* 115
49. Newman's feeling about the *Rambler*—The danger of theology—Acton's Parliamentary duties *Page* 116
50. "Catholic Affairs"—The *Weekly Register*—Simpson's "Theory of Party"—Gladstone compared with Russell and Palmerston *Page* 119
51. Thanks from Bishop Ullathorne *Page* 122
52. Reform a normal growth—"The Philosopher's Stone" *Page* 123
53. Newman's opinion of Arnold—Lacordaire's ignorance of history—Napoleon III and the Roman question—A motto for the *Rambler* *Page* 126
54. Newman and Oxenham—Alleged phials from the Catacombs *Page* 128
55. De Vere's congratulations—Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*—Political science and theology *Page* 129
56. Prisons and workhouses—Cardinal Wiseman dying *Page* 130
57. Books must be criticized on their merits—Robertson as a Church historian—Morris' *Life of St Thomas*—"The Philosopher's Stone" *Page* 131
58. Dr Northcote's article on the Catacombs—The Lords and the Commons—Is aristocracy an element of progress in a State? *Page* 134
59. The House of Lords not representative—The uses of nobility in a State—A *Saturday Reviewer* on Dalton's *Ximenes* *Page* 135
60. The *Rambler* and the *Register*—Newman on the "foreign Toryism" of the *Rambler*—Gladstone and Palmerston *Page* 136
61. Acton is sick of men who are afraid of a scandal—Metaphysical speculation in the *Rambler*—A question to Lord John Russell *Page* 138
62. Lord Lyons' dispatches on the Papal States—The true cause of disaffection—Papal concessions—Garibaldi's decree against priests—Revolution the great enemy of reform—Antonelli's foolish wishes *Page* 140
63. Mr Wetherell's zeal—Letters from Oakeley and Newman on education in Seminaries *Page* 143
64. A clerical policy—All classes should have representation—Guizot *Page* 144
65. Newman and the Catacombs Ampullæ—Father de Buck on "Rites"—Some Irish articles—The Catholic Charities Bill—Praise of the *Rambler* *Page* 146
66. Lord Lyons—Views on the Roman question *Page* 147
67. Newman's "Ancient Saints"—Newman on the irresponsibility of editors *Page* 148
68. Oxenham's dealing with Newman—Döllinger—Materials for a modern history of the Popes—Montalembert's *Monks of the West* *Page* 149

Letters of Lord Acton

69. W. G. Ward—The Pope leaving Rome—Döllinger's opinion—Peter's Pence—Need for a Catholic Record Society *Page* 152
70. Acton's article on Döllinger *Page* 156
71. The Reconstitution of Austria-Hungary—The Concordat *Page* 158
72. The Education Question—Newman and Oxenham *Page* 161
73. Approval of the *Rambler*—Criticisms on Simpson's "Campion" *Page* 162
74. Campion's writings—Newman's view of the Council of Trent—W. G. Ward—Educational topics—Secrecy and degeneracy—The education of the clergy—The example of France—Is the bulk of literature dangerous? *Page* 165
75. More letters on the education question—Review of Ward *Page* 170
76. Newman on the *Rambler*—The Roman question acute *Page* 172
77. Giesler—The immunities of the clergy—Gregory VII and the Church's supremacy—Innocent III and Papal omnipotence *Page* 173
78. Growth of papal power—The Guelphs and Ghibellines *Page* 176
79. "The Political Causes of the American Revolution" *Page* 181
80. The "deposing power"—Campion's Life—True meaning of "Gallican"—The safe conduct of Huss—The conversion of Bohemia *Page* 183
81. Gladstone's "Budget"—Döllinger's public lecture on the Roman question—Medieval colouring in John of Salisbury *Page* 187
82. Newman's views on the Roman question—A pamphlet by Passaglia—A party at Gladstone's *Page* 188
83. Simpson's "Reason and Faith" *Page* 189
84. Simpson and his critics—The political power of the Popes—Newman's letter on the Council of Trent—A review of Dr Doyle's life *Page* 189
85. Cardinal Wiseman at Thorndon—Newman's annoyance at Simpson's "habit of pea-shooting"—In principle agrees with the *Rambler* *Page* 191
86. The action of moral and physical sciences on religion—The battle of the Church to be fought with the weapons of the age—Natural science and religion—Newman—Döllinger and the Temporal Power *Page* 192
87. Döllinger's book will make "each particular hair stand on end"—Materials for the *Rambler*—Montalembert's *Monks of the West*—The incapacity of Parliament to deal with India *Page* 198
88. Scheme of amalgamation under Newman—The *Rambler* as a *damnosa hereditas*—The *Rambler* likely to be soon in the wars *Page* 200
89. The new publishers for the *Rambler*—"The lay-Catholic organ"—Montalembert's speeches and pamphlets reviewed *Page* 203
90. Newman wishes the *Rambler* to end—Antonelli and the Index—Discussion of "all questions not decided by authority" *Page* 206
92. Manning on Papal sovereignty—Origin of Papal Temporal Power—The Papacy not national—Some Temporal sovereignty necessary for the Pope's freedom—Early Popes on the nature of their power *Page* 211
93. Possibility of the Pope having to go into exile—Döllinger's book *Page* 215
94. Acton's Review of Döllinger *Page* 218
95. De Tocqueville—Compared with other Frenchmen and with Burke *Page* 219

The Contents

96. Future of the Church in America—Newman and the *Rambler* *Page* 220
97. The Church wants freedom for corporations—The medieval theory—In politics the Church need not seek her own ends *Page* 221
98. Natural sciences and religion *Page* 223
99. Difficulty of writing short literary notices *Page* 224
100. Tocqueville's picture of America—The function of the historian—Liberty an acquisition not a gift—The restoration of the Pope *Page* 226
101. Liberty—Growth of the idea in Europe—The Crusades—The State in Roman law—The Church against feudal absolutism *Page* 230
102. The function of the State—Ultramontanism—Distinction between States and Corporations—The Catholic "Academy" *Page* 234
103. Difference between doctrine and discipline—The claims of the Church are founded on her institutions, not on her history *Page* 236
104. Newman's ill health—The merits of Dickens *Page* 237
105. Montalembert on Döllinger—Sudden death of Eckstein *Page* 239
106. Oxenham as a disputant—Accents in Latin—Analysis of Döllinger—Novels and Literature—The religion of the novelist *Page* 240
107. Morality of persecution—Guerra's work on Papal constitutions—An apology for the Reign of Terror—Goldwin Smith's errors *Page* 243
108. Goldwin Smith's "Irish History"—Döllinger's treatment of positive Protestantism—St Vincent de Paul—Indiscriminate alms *Page* 245
109. Archbishop Laud's failure—The lesson of the Revolution—How Papal power was preserved in the Middle Ages—The Temporal power and the balance of power *Page* 247
110. Cardinal Wiseman—Newman wishes St John to write *Page* 251
111. Limitations to the power of the State—Administration of Church property—Liberty and law—Difficulty as to Religion governing a State—The domain of Conscience and of the State *Page* 253
112. Gratry's opinion of Döllinger's book—Lacordaire's views *Page* 257
113. Principles of voluntary poverty—Benedictines and Franciscans—Effect of living on alms in Spain *Page* 258
114. Some Stuart papers—A MS. life of Mary Stuart *Page* 259
115. Parliament—Tories opposed to Disraeli but hate Gladstone—Party disorganization—Stansfeld's manner—Bright's bitterness *Page* 261
116. A Conservative reaction—An aristocratic element of reaction in foreign affairs—Palmerston's strong feeling against Austria—Attitude of Catholics to Italian question—Why Palmerston is tolerated *Page* 262
117. Döllinger on Simpson's "Campion"—The question of the reception of Charles II into the Church *Page* 266
118. Proposed change of the *Rambler* to a quarterly *Page* 267
119. History of the negotiations for an amalgamation of the *Rambler* and *Dublin Review*—Newman's arbitration refused *Page* 267
120. Suggestions as to *Rambler* writers and subjects *Page* 269
121. Acton suggests a line of reply to Bishop Grant *Page* 270
122. Father Bolto's Stuart Papers *Page* 272

123. Amalgamation with the *Dublin* again discussed—Dr Russell and Canon Macmullen consent to act as advisers—Acton's terms *Page* 273
124. The conversion of Charles II—The negotiations with the *Dublin*—Editorial limitations—"Communicated" articles *Page* 275
125. A German Protestant's contributions—The *Dublin* *Page* 277
126. The English and Spanish systems of colonization—Bacon's view of plantations—Discussions with Oxenham *Page* 278
127. Brewer likely to be a troublesome contributor—The "Lingard Society"—Negotiations for Vatican Archives—Books to review *Page* 281
128. Further researches into the history of the Stuarts—Simpson's *Life of Campion*—The *Life of Milner* *Page* 282
129. Proposed successor to the *Rambler*—Contributions by Morris, Capes and Paley—"Elements of Conservative Reaction" *Page* 283
130. Some other contributors—A writer on Biblical science *Page* 285
131. J. B. Morris on the Gospels—Darnell as an historical writer *Page* 287
132. Suggests "Wolsey" as the subject of an article by Brewer—The contents of the *Home and Foreign*—Milman is staggered *Page* 288
133. The decay of Brownson *Page* 289
134. Bishop Ullathorne attacks the methods of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign*—Newman counsels submission—Acton's own course *Page* 289
135. Parochial relief of the poor—The difference between charity and relief—The evils of relief by means of public works *Page* 290
136. Cardinal Wiseman—Patience and "a duck's back" *Page* 292
137. Acton's desire "to be left alone"—"Shropshire" *Page* 293
138. The contents of "our model number" *Page* 294
139. Acton criticizes Simpson's reply to attacks *Page* 295
140. Simpson's "Three Generations"—Kinglake's "splendid, mischievous performance" *Page* 297
141. A proposed article on "Ultramontanism"—Renouf on "Orientalism" *Page* 298
142. A gift to the Bollandists—Suarez and Christian politics—Manning's Radicalism *Page* 299
143. Proposed article on the Catacombs—Pitra's elevation to the Cardinalate—Spurious Acts of martyrs—Kinglake's *Crimea* *Page* 300
144. Acton proposes an article on "Epigrams"—Conversion of Lady Herbert of Lea *Page* 301
145. A restored Poland *Page* 302
146. Preparation for the *Home and Foreign*—Bishop Brown's opinion *Page* 304
147. The Bishop converted to the value of the *Home and Foreign*—Eulogy in Cardinal Cullen's organ *Page* 305
148. Writers for the Review—M. Block named—Simpson's projected article on Shakespeare—The Sonnets—Thackeray as a critic, etc. *Page* 309
149. Shakespeare's Sonnets—Balzac, Thackeray and Trollope *Page* 312
150. Bacon's *Philosophy of Shakespeare*—Thackeray *Page* 314
151. The doctrines of the *Home and Foreign*—Newman's sympathy *Page* 315

The Contents

152. Frohschammer's errors—His heresy on development *Page* 316
153. Condemnation of the "foremost principle" of the *Home and Foreign*—Acton's wish to close its career at once *Page* 317
154. A declaration of policy—Acton hopes that his literary partnership with Simpson is not at an end *Page* 318
155. Preparations for the *Chronicle*—Acton's advice—How to secure the best writers—His high opinion of Father Stevenson *Page* 321
156. Foreign subscribers—Suggestions as to reviewers—Rawson Gardiner and Bryce *Page* 327
157. Visit with Gladstone to Monte Cassino—Education and the raising of the masses—The resisting power of the Papal army *Page* 329
158. Attempted arrangement between Italy and Rome—Why the Duke of Argyll will not see the Pope—Disraeli's Reform Bill *Page* 330
159. The appearance of the *Chronicle*—Mode of electing a Pope *Page* 333
160. Rome and the *Westminster Gazette*—Passaglia's reported retractation—Difficulty of financial arrangement between Church and State *Page* 335
161. The question of toleration in Rome—Some Roman prisons *Page* 335
162. Dangerous state of Italy—Catholics to stand aloof from the elections—Red Republicans and the blood of the priests *Page* 340
163. Question of Lord Granville's premiership—Gladstone willing to serve under him—Some biographical works—Dutch affairs *Page* 342
164. Importance of getting able writers for the *Chronicle* *Page* 343
165. Acton congratulates Wetherell upon the *Chronicle*—Some of the articles want "fun"—Alleged anti-Prussian tendency of the Catholic clergy—Father Stevenson and the Venetian archives *Page* 345
166. The first number of the *Chronicle*—Revolutionary proclamations in Rome *Page* 347
167. Writers and subjects for the *North British Review* *Page* 350
168. Possible writers for the *North British*—The old writers *Page* 352
169. Acton's article on the Massacre of St Bartholomew—A book on the Council—Gladstone offers Acton a peerage *Page* 355
170. Simpson's illness—Acton's tribute to Simpson *Page* 357
171. Gladstone's *Vaticanism* pamphlet—Acton argues against its publication *Page* 358
172. The Vatican decrees—Archbishop Manning's correspondence with Acton—Meaning of the word *submission* *Page* 359
173. Manning's further questions—Acton's own bishop *Page* 362
174. The Vatican decrees—Acton's real position *Page* 363
175. Acton and his Bishop—Acton's real attitude *Page* 365
176. Gladstone's appeal not to be met by denial—The Vatican Council capable of "a Catholic explanation"—Gladstone's attack not on the Council, but on Ultramontanism—Acton's orthodoxy *Page* 366
177. Acton has not attacked or rejected the Council *Page* 368
178. Acton's letter and his reception of the "definition" *Page* 370

Conclusion *Page* 371

LORD ACTON AND HIS CIRCLE

THE letters of the late Lord Acton here published are for the most part on literary subjects. They were commenced when he was only twenty-four years of age; and in more ways than one, according to the opinion of many, they show us the real Acton, as he was in the period of his greatest literary activity. In them may be seen his vast reading, his great industry, his marvellous memory and his acquaintance with writers in every country of Europe and with books of every kind on almost every subject. The letters themselves were mostly written in connexion with certain literary undertakings, which occupied some of the busiest years of his early life, from 1858 to 1871. In the former year he became part-proprietor of an existing Catholic magazine called the *Rambler*, the sub-editor of which was one of the most brilliant of the Oxford Converts of 1845, Mr Richard Simpson. Under the new management Simpson was appointed editor, and in this way a lasting friendship was formed between him and Sir John Acton. They became united in an association in literary matters, which continued for many years, and the nature of which is plainly indicated in the letters here given to the public.

The greater part of these communications were made by Acton to Simpson during a period of six years from 1858 to 1864, and they relate to the conduct and work of the *Rambler* and of the quarterly into which it developed, the *Home and Foreign Review*. The letters of the period from 1867 to 1871 were mostly addressed to Mr T. F. Wetherell in connexion with a weekly paper, the *Chronicle*, of which he was editor, and in which Acton took great interest. To this he contributed a good deal of literary matter, although it had a brief career of only ten months. In 1869 Mr Wetherell was asked to edit the *North British Review*, and in this he was supported by Sir John Acton and the same band of brilliant writers who had been connected with the *Home and Foreign Review* and the *Chronicle*. In order to understand the purpose of the letters in this volume it is necessary to say something about each of these four literary ventures. The greater part of the letters were given to me by Mr William Simpson, the nephew of the recipient, Mr Richard Simpson; the rest were entrusted to me by Mr Wetherell, to whom they were written.

In the beginning of 1848 the first number of the *Rambler* was published. Singular misapprehension seems to exist, even in well-informed quarters, in regard to the persons responsible for it in the various stages of its course. Quite recently an attempt* has

* In an article by Father Pollen, "An Error in Simpson's *Campion*," we read: "He [Mr Simpson] was received into the Church in 1845. A couple of years later he became editor of the *Rambler*, a noted Catholic magazine of those days. There are always risks when a very recent convert, however sincere, begins to instruct his fellow-Catholics from an editorial chair. In 1848 many subtle questions concerning the position of Catholicism to

been made to explain the psychology of its attitude towards authority by the statement that Mr Richard Simpson took up the post of editor very shortly after his conversion to the Catholic faith in 1845. Such misapprehensions may easily lead to an entire misunderstanding of the inner history of English Catholicity of the last century in its most critical period.* It will be useful therefore first to state the facts.

The *Rambler* was first started as a weekly journal in January, 1848, by John Moore Capes, who was its proprietor for the first ten years of its existence. During most of that time he was its editor and contributed extensively to its pages. It is only just to the memory of this distinguished convert that his connexion with the magazine should be recorded at some length, as his part in the undertaking seems to have been strangely overlooked. Mr Capes was born in 1812, and, having passed through Westminster School, he graduated at Balliol College, Oxford. In course of time he became incumbent of St John's, Bridgewater, where his close connexion with Dr Northcote, which subsequently continued in regard to the management of the *Rambler*, first began. Mr Capes was mainly

Liberalism were being disputed, and Mr Simpson, still a very young man, while treating these subjects, gradually lost touch with Cardinal Wiseman and the English Bishops."

* Mr Herbert Paul (*Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, Introd. XXVII) says: "The editor of the *Rambler* was the greatest of converts, John Henry Newman. In 1859 an article of Newman's on consulting the laity in matters of doctrine was condemned by authority of Rome, and Newman withdrew from the editorial chair. He was succeeded by Sir John Acton, and no better choice could have been made. He edited the *Rambler* till 1862, when it became merged in the *Home and Foreign Review*." It will be seen subsequently that every statement here made is inaccurate or altogether wrong.

instrumental in building a new church at St John's and in bringing about a marked religious "revival" in the parish. In 1845 he threw up his living to enter the Catholic Church.

After his conversion he became for a time a tutor at Prior Park, near Bath, and whilst there, in 1846, he conceived the idea of starting the *Rambler*, and at once wrote to Father Newman for his advice. In reply Newman wrote the following letters:

"*Maryvale, July* 13, 1846.

"I have just returned from London, and find your letter. To save the post I write you a short answer to your inquiry.

"Such a magazine as you propose is very much wanted, and for many reasons Prior Park is the place for it. Your having a press is a sufficient reason, and there are others too.

"Nothing could please me more, and I am sure all of us, than to do what we could in the way of assistance, but I have one or two difficulties. One, which is not a great one, is that Mr Keon* has most kindly and earnestly pressed me to write for *Dolman's Magazine*. I have declined on the ground that I have never written in a literary publication, and certainly the tone and style is not such as I should like to take part in. This would be no reason against assisting you in a religious magazine, if it really were professedly religious, or at least, critical, philosophical, etc. I mean *grave*. Another

* Miles Gerald Keon, born in Tipperary 1821, died in Bermuda 1875. He was educated at Stonyhurst College, and became a distinguished journalist and a correspondent to some of the chief London newspapers. In April, 1846, he became for a few months editor of *Dolman's Magazine*.

reason, not a very strong one either, is that I should like Dr Wiseman to give his formal approval of the project before I *promised* to assist, i.e., before I could be reckoned upon, or become more than an occasional contributor.

"Ever yours affectionately,
"JOHN H. NEWMAN."

The following day a second letter from Newman put the difficulties of starting such a magazine as Capes proposed very clearly before him.

"*St Mary Vale, Perry Bar, July* 14, '46.

"There will be difficulties in your way which it is well to be prepared for. One will be the anxiety arising from the work being written by *converts* only or principally. And it will seem to be setting up against Mr Keon, who is a Catholic. Mr Keon's talents and zeal command one's respect, and he has been very friendly to myself personally; yet I do not think he can conduct a periodical; he is too young (in Aristotle's sense). I wish you could make some arrangement with him, yet do not see how; for when you cast off editor and publishers a very poor identity would remain between his magazine and yours, supposing a coalition were possible. Yet I think this a difficulty, and without meaning to say that Catholics take up Mr Keon's publications, yet it will be one of your collisions with old Catholics.

"But you will say: We shall not write so much for them as for Anglicans. Then another difficulty comes, on which I dwelt in conversation with Mr Thompson.

How will you get Anglicans to buy your magazine? I mean, how will you enable them to get it? They go to the publisher and ask for the *Prior Park Gazette* or the *Downside Magazine*, and they are quietly told there is no such a publication, or it has stopped, or it is out of print, or that it is not published in London; or at any rate they have to send to town for the number which they wish to buy as a specimen. Only one copy is sent for, and the second person who goes has to go through the same process. The bookseller in Birmingham had never heard of the *Christian Remembrancer*, and could be made only with difficulty to get it. If at last it is ordered, there is a mistake. The first month it comes, then it stops. The difficulty arises in great measure from country shops corresponding with but one London publisher, who is careless about all books but his own publications. We found this difficulty almost fatal to the *Tracts for the Times* for a while, and overcame it only in the course of years.

"At this moment there is no Oxford shop where publications such as Thompson's and Northcote's can be seen. And I do not see well how this is to be obviated. Parker found his only effectual way of selling his best books was employing a traveller or bagman to go about the country with them. Toovey is the most natural medium of a plan such as yours, but as far as I can make out, he is indifferent to publishing altogether.

"The only other remark it strikes me to make is that a magazine, particularly if monthly, takes a great deal of time."

For some reason or other, possibly because of the difficulties urged in the foregoing letters, the project was abandoned for a time, and it was not till January 1, 1848, that the first weekly number of the *Rambler* saw the light. In this form, however, it continued only until August 26 of the same year, when the editor announced that "in order to carry on the journal with increased vigour and efficiency" it would henceforth be published in monthly numbers. It was obviously impossible that a magazine conducted as the *Rambler* was from the first, with straightforward honesty of purpose, and with the motto *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, et in omnibus charitas*, could long escape the censure of those who differed from it either in principle or on the expediency of discussing delicate questions in public. An article by Capes in December, 1848, on "Catholic and Protestant Collegiate Education" was received with strong expressions of dissent in many quarters. To these criticisms Capes replied in a remarkably able article on "The Duties of Journalists" in the January number, in which he explains how important a matter it is that Catholics should not burke discussion on unpleasant matters, merely because they are unpleasant. In his original paper his object he says was twofold: "It was first, to draw attention to the fact (assuming such to be the fact) that our secular education is, on the whole, inferior to the education which Protestants receive, and secondly, to account for it, by pointing out the almost overwhelming difficulties which have embarrassed the labours of those who have had the charge of the education of our youth." What are the patent

facts? the writer asks. Education must be judged by the literature it produces.

"What then is *our* literary and intellectual condition at the present moment? Can we claim a high place in English literature? Can we claim any place at all? Is there such a thing as a Catholic English literature in existence, from the profoundest theology down to the most trifling school-books?"

Mr Capes then went on to deprecate any concealment, even were such concealment possible. "If we *are* worse than Protestants, in all honesty and manly courage let us avow it, and claim for ourselves the undeniable admission that it is through the tyranny and spoliation of an anti-Catholic government that we have been robbed of all our ancient means of instruction."*

On the publication of the number containing the above-named article Capes received from Newman a letter on the subject:

"Your new number is a very good one, and the sale ought to increase, as it does. The defence of the 'scandalous' paper on 'Catholic Education' is very much to the purpose, and I should trust would soothe people; but I don't think you can quite get over it. You will be sure to have done good by mooting the subject; and all Catholics ought, as many will, be obliged to you; but still you cannot get over the whole difficulty, because your original article had the tone of a hostile attack, instead of a double dose of butter to introduce an unpleasant subject. However, never mind; the *Rambler* is doing a great deal of good, and

**Rambler*, III, pp. 326-327.

we cannot do good without giving offence and incurring criticism.

"It has struck me that not enough is made, in comparing systems of education, of the test which enables a man to *write* best. Now, the desultory education of Catholic colleges—which is the same which Davison and Copleston opposed against the *Edinburgh* forty years since—has no teaching, I think, to make men write well; that is, it furnishes the mind neither with the fullness of thought nor the power of composition which is necessary for good writing. If this is the case, it is beside the mark to compare the two systems, as Oakeley does,* as one being the 'more extended' and the other 'the more exact' or 'thorough': the question is, which makes the mind the more effective? This is a safe and apposite utilitarian argument. How few Catholics can compose!"

In the February number of the *Rambler* Dr W. G. Ward summed up the controversy on Catholic education by a long signed article. It contains much that is of extreme and, indeed, of more than passing interest, and for many reasons the whole of this controversy would repay the reading at the present day. Newman's remark upon Ward's letter was that "it is very 'capitulous,' but I suspect it will be a shot over Dr Ullathorne's head and other old Catholics."

For some time at Mr Capes's request Dr Newman kept an eye on the theological matter printed in the *Rambler*, although he disclaimed any responsibility and made it quite clear that in this he was only acting as a friend. He also readily replied to Mr Capes

* In a letter printed in the same number of the *Rambler*, January, 1849.

in any difficulty that had been raised in the course of his editorial work. The inherent interest of these letters is naturally great, and it is difficult to refrain from quoting from one such luminous exposition of a point proposed to him in December, 1849. The question was as to the nature of the proofs of Christianity. "Such a subject," he writes, "requires very delicate treatment. Your Italian divines, whom I sincerely wish to follow in dogmatics, are not in my mind the best of polemics. Now the proof of Christianity is just the point on which polemics and dogmatics meet as on common ground. It is the province of both, and I cannot altogether stand the Italian treatment of it; unless I mistake their words, and they mine, they know nothing at all of heretics as realities. They live at best in Rome, in a place whose boast is that it has never given birth to heresy; and they think proofs ought to be convincing which in fact are not. Hence they are accustomed to speak of the argument for Catholicity as a 'demonstration'; and to see no force in objection to it, and to admit no perplexity of intellect which is not directly and immediately wilful. This at least is their position in fact, even if I overstate their theory. They have not a dream what England is, and what is the power of fascination which the Anglican Church (e.g.) exerts in the case of many minds. F. Passaglia understood it a little better when he got to Westminster Abbey, and declared the chanting to be a great 'scandalo,' that is, of course, that its attraction would keep people from joining the Church; and I suspect he was cowed by the vision of Oxford. At present they will not abide in Italy

the use of terms which—if not the ideas also contained in them—are received with us; e.g., when you in your papers on 'Four Years' Experience' speak of the argument for Catholicity being the 'great probability' (do you not?), you say what would scandalize an Italian and would be put down to my school. At least one Jesuit attacked me as a probabilist in doctrine, though I am not conscious of dreaming of being one; but I don't feel clear that I should not offend those whom I wish to be on good terms with."

It was not only in regard to these more serious subjects that Newman gave his advice and his encouragement to Mr Capes in the early days of the *Rambler*. For example, after looking through the number for April, 1850, he says that he "thinks the *Rambler* is cleverer each number." He has been specially interested in looking over the proofs of a paper on "Southey's Life and Correspondence," although he does not quite agree with the criticism of Southey's poems. "*Thalaba*," he adds, "has ever been to my feelings the most sublime of English poems—(I don't know Spenser)—I mean morally sublime. The versification of *Thalaba* is most melodious too—many persons will not observe they are reading blank verse. I heard of him first (which proves nothing) when the *Rejected Addresses* came out in the winter of 1812-13. Then I read *Kehama*, and got it well-nigh by heart. Of course, a boy may easily confuse his first knowledge with the post-popularity of an author. I can't help thinking that Southey's poems were not read *at once* like Scott's. I recollect hearing Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel* read out as early, I suppose, as 1809."

In 1856 Mr Capes had some thought about turning the *Rambler* into a quarterly review, and the rumour of difficulties which involved the *Dublin* for the second time brought the idea of a possible amalgamation to the front. Newman on this matter wrote from Dublin on March 31 as follows:

"You know I have always preferred a quarterly to a more frequent periodical, and so far I should like you to make the change. Yet is not at this moment the *Rambler* doing better than the *Dublin?* Did you think of the *Dublin*, I should stipulate, were I you, for the most perfect autocracy in conducting it, for it is commonly said that there is some secret influence, some say Richardson himself, which is able to half edit it without the editor.

"Next I never would undertake it without being able to pay the writers well. You never will get on otherwise. The *Times* and *Quarterly* make it a simple matter of business, so do all well-conducted publications. You have no hold on persons unless there is a commercial bargain. You know this well enough—I knew it in the *Critic*. Again, not only persons won't be bound, and promise to write without writing, but they have to make a livelihood, and time is money. . . We had a good deal of talk about the *Dublin* for the University, and I suppose we should be disposed to take and edit it, if we had money for writing; but there is the rub, and I expect will be with you."

During a period of two years, from 1852 to 1854, the *Rambler* was edited by Capes's lifelong friend, Dr Northcote, who had from the first contributed many valuable papers to the magazine. In October, 1854, however, the latter resigned his post as editor; and in view of the retirement Capes, who was still the proprietor and indeed principal contributor, wrote to Mr Richard Simpson on April 20, 1854, to ask him to become his assistant editor. This offer was, however, declined on the ground that, having undertaken to teach a pupil, his time was more than fully occupied. In response, however, to another letter, Simpson undertook to write "a sheet and a half for each number of the *Rambler*, partly short notices, partly reviews"; but a letter from Capes, dated June 1, 1854, makes it clear that this was done as a simple contributor, and that Simpson had no part in, or responsibility for, the conduct of the magazine. It was not until September, 1856, that he was induced to accept the post of sub-editor under Capes, and, upon the latter's retirement and disposal of his interest in the concern, Simpson became editor in 1858. The further fortunes of the editorship may be summed up in the following memorandum in Simpson's own hand: "Taken out of R. Simpson's hands by Wiseman, Ullathorne and Grant;* undertaken by Newman as a bi-monthly, May and July. Relinquished by Newman at the request of Ullathorne, and restored to us in September. The owners [were] Acton, Simpson, Capes;† the editors were Acton and Wetherell with Simpson, and they remained so until the publication of the *Rambler* ceased in 1862." Cardi-

* This was in 1859. † Frederick Capes,

nal Newman was thus responsible for only two numbers; he had nothing to do with the conduct of the *Home and Foreign Review*, the name under which the *Rambler* was continued.

Still, though Newman had direct control over the *Rambler* for a very brief time, his indirect influence over writers and contributions was very considerable at all times. Some of this appears in the letters here printed; and with the general literary movement his sympathy cannot be doubted. In a very special way he desired to see a cultivated Catholic laity able to make use of the advantages of education in defence of their religion and to give an account of the faith that was in them. As early as 1851 he writes:

"What I desiderate in Catholics is the gift of *bringing* [*out*] what they are, what their religion is. . . I want a laity, not arrogant, not rash in speech, not disputatious, but men who know their religion, who enter into it, who know just where they stand, who know what they hold and what they do not, who know their creed so well that they can give an account of it, and who know enough of history to defend it. I want an intelligent, well-instructed laity. . . I wish you to enlarge your knowledge, to cultivate your reason, to get an insight into the relation of truth to truth, to learn to view things as they are, to understand how faith and reason stand to each other, what are the bases of Catholicism, and where lie the main inconsistencies and absurdities of the Protestant theory. . . In all times the laity have been the measure of Catholicism."*

It was to further these views that Cardinal Newman

* *Lectures on the Position of Catholics in England.*

undertook to be the first president of the Catholic University of Dublin, and for this that he sympathised so much with the general programme of the *Rambler.*

It would, however, be quite wrong to attribute either to Newman's influence, or to his encouragement, direct or indirect, the strained relations with the ecclesiastical authorities which were making themselves evident even before the retirement of Mr Capes from the conduct of the magazine. Newman, as his letters show, was always anxious that every endeavour should be made to work loyally with Cardinal Wiseman and the bishops generally, and he frequently counselled the avoidance of subjects liable to be misunderstood, especially upon theological or quasi-theological matters. The following letter to Capes, written when the publication of Mr Simpson's article on "Original Sin" in May, 1856, had involved the *Rambler* in difficulties with the authorities, will show clearly Dr Newman's attitude in this respect:

"*Dublin, January* 19, 1857.

"I am such a slave now to my business here—the term for which, I rejoice to say, is rapidly coming—that I know nothing of the course of things. Suddenly I find that there is a great split between old Catholics and converts, and I see in the *Register* that the *Dublin* is writing against the *Rambler.* Also I see that you have not been the editor of the latter, and now are. I am truly glad to find that you have not been responsible for that article on 'Original Sin,' etc., which seemed to me flat against the *Schola theologorum* and very unjustifiable; but whether you were or not, I have too grateful a recollection of the ser-

vices of the *Rambler* to the Catholic cause not to be much grieved that the *Dublin* should be writing against it. And I must say that, whoever wrote the article, what I saw of it in the *Register* did not prepossess me in its favour.

"I am opposed to laymen writing theology, on the same principle that I am against amateur doctors, and still more lawyers—not because they are laymen, but because they are αὐτοδίδακτοι. For this reason I am disgusted with Brownson. I don't exclude myself. I have not written on dogmatics or asceticism since I have been a Catholic, and I suppose never shall, because I gave up private judgement when I became one. History and controversy are quite large enough slices of the theological province for a magazine. At least, this is my opinion. Excuse this freedom; my one reason for writing is that I don't like the *Rambler* to be abused, much less by a dreary publication like the *Dublin*, which wakes up to growl or to lecture, and then goes to sleep again."

As to Newman's real appreciation of the value of the work done for Catholicity by Mr Capes in founding and conducting the *Rambler*, there can be no doubt. The following words from a letter written to him when the rumour was about that he was retiring from the editorship in 1858 make this quite clear:

"I think," writes Newman, "that the Catholic body in this country owes you much gratitude from the *animus* and object of your undertaking, the devotion you have shown to it for so long a time, and the various important benefits it has done us. But it is well for us, my dear Capes, that we do not look out

for any reward for what we do in this world, for whether we do or not, we are sure not to get it; for what we do imperfectly or wrongly affects the public ten times more than what we do well, even though the good may be ten times as much as the amiss. But this is God's merciful dispensation to oblige us to look up to Him and lay up treasures above, whether we will or no."

The line that the *Rambler* took from the first was novel. It proclaimed its "entire and resolute independence" of all powerful interests, public parties, or knots of private friends, although, as far as it is now possible to determine, it maintained this attitude rather by ignoring the divisions that existed among Catholics than by criticising them all in any independent way. But this probably was a necessity of its position. On any other terms it might have been impossible to establish the periodical at all. Besides, the small knot of converts to whom it owed its origin could scarcely have had any very definite convictions on the merits or very true ideas of the history of the various existing parties, and were themselves too independent of each other, too inconsistent and immature in Catholic thought and knowledge to be capable of forming a party of their own.

The converts were at this time a body both numerically large and intellectually powerful. They formed undoubtedly an element most beneficial to the English Catholics generally. It is hardly too much to characterise them as a leaven, which through the Tractarian movement God's providence had placed in the midst of our body at a time when it most needed it.

But no one who has studied the literature of this period could call them a "party" within the Church. "The convert influence," says the *Rambler*, "has not been exercised apart, but has expended its strength rather in lending energy to the rising ideas of the time than in forming the nucleus for a new and distinct phase of Catholic opinion." Cardinal Wiseman allows this even in the very article which he wrote against the *Rambler* in 1857 on the ground of its striving to set up a convert party against the old Catholics—a charge which, on calmly reviewing the controversy after well-nigh half a century, seems to have arisen from the misconstruction of certain phrases in a somewhat unwise and petulant article of the magazine.* Wiseman, in his reply, says that "the intellectual separation of a knot of able persons is at once the creation of a party upon the very worst ground, that of a distinction of old and new Catholics."† This attempt he deprecates, because rightly he does not admit the existence of the two parties;‡ and at the same time he allows that the *Rambler*, if it ever tried, had never the least success in forming a party. After comparing, with what sounds like the disappointment of an editor, the popularity of the *Rambler* with that of the *Dublin Review*, he shows how the former with its superior circulation has "never exercised any practical influence nor led public opinion amongst us." This is because "its writers do not attempt to throw them-

* The article in question was "The Rising Generation: our Poor Schools." It gave great offence to Cardinal Wiseman, and it has, I believe, generally been attributed to Simpson or to his influence. There is no harm now in saying that the article was written by the late Provost Wenham.

† *Dublin Review*, vol. XLI, p. 450.

‡ Ibid. p. 453.

selves into the true position of Catholics. They stand aloof, and do not share the real burden of Catholic labour. They lecture admirably; find imperfections in what is done; give excellent theoretical instruction on our duties as Catholics. But they address us rather as a speaker does from the hustings from without and above the crowd addressed."* Any such attitude of independent criticism was condemned by the Cardinal as one of the displays of party spirit which the authorities of the Church could not safely endure and which must be put down at any cost.

As early as 1848 in his *Words of Peace and Justice*, a pamphlet published in support of the Government project of entering into diplomatic relations with Rome, Wiseman incidentally sketched what he conceived to be the respective spheres of action of laity and clergy. To the laity he assigned the world of politics, legislation and administration, the part of commerce, the army and navy, "every profession which enriches or ennobles, every pursuit which gives fame and honour, by research in science, or genius in art, or popularity in literature," courts, exchanges, public halls and private firesides. To the clergy he reserves only one thing—the Church of God; and not only its internal government and guidance, but its external protection and defence. "The Church," he adds, "does indeed often want your zealous co-operation, your social influence, your learned or ready pen, your skilful pencil, your brilliant talents, your weighty name, your abundant means. But the direction, the rule belongs to us. We will call you forth when the Church of God wants your aid; we will

* Ibid. p. 450.

always gladly see you working with us, but we cannot permit you to lead where religious interests are concerned."*

This much it seems necessary to quote from a now forgotten pamphlet, in order to explain the subsequent attitude of the ecclesiastical authorities to the *Rambler* spirit in general and to certain of its writers in particular. For it would seem to follow from the above declaration of policy that the only ecclesiastical subjects on which the laity were to speak, except according to the *mot d'ordre* of ecclesiastical authority, were questions of taste and dilettantism, obsolete controversies† or matters of no particular present interest or importance. At least this was the interpretation which was, and with increasing emphasis, put upon his pronouncement during the years of Cardinal Wiseman's administration.

That Newman thought very highly of the work that Mr Capes was doing for Catholics in the *Rambler* cannot be doubted. The following letter would be sufficient to prove this, were proof necessary. It is also interesting as suggesting to Capes a scheme of lecturing on Catholic matters of interest, which was subsequently tried with only partial success, owing apparently to a misunderstanding as to the intentions of the lecturers.

"*Birmingham, February* 21, 1851.

"I am very sorry to hear of your indisposition. You must get well for the good of the Church. Those who have a *view,* have indefinite power over those

* pp. 15, 16. † Cf. *Dublin Review*, vol. XLI, pp. 442-43.

who have none. You say too that there is good materials among the younger men of all classes. I dare say it may be in the event advisable for our bishops to do nothing, but for that reason, if for no other, the laity should stir. I like the article on 'How shall we Meet the Protestant Aggression?'* though when I like a thing I always fear it is imprudent and violent.

"I do think you should get a set of fellows who will devote themselves to the cause of the Church. Let it be their recreation, as geology or ecclesiology might be, which is their *work*. Would the 'committee for supplying members with information' furnish such? Men do with a special gusto what they do themselves—it is an outlet to private judgement. I do wish you could do it, it is a great object. Cannot you have some half-dozen or more? It should be quite voluntary and informal at first, only with the secret sanction of the Cardinal and Dr Ullathorne. If you do anything in getting them to approve it, command me.

"Ward I suppose would not walk with other men or lead them. Is there no Old Catholic of sufficient calibre to begin? I would throw over all but energetic men. This you could not do if the Bishops' names were openly given to it, for they would offend respectable or noble nobodies if they did not include them, but if it were voluntary, the choice would be your own.

"Why should not half a dozen meet and consecrate their purpose by a religious act? their object being to stir up their brethren to the duty of maintaining and

* Printed in the *Rambler*, February, 1851, pp. 249 sqq.

impressing on the people of England the spiritual independence of the Church, as a kingdom not of this world? Or take a larger subject, not to the exclusion of this, viz: of bringing before the laity the position of the Church in England and method of defending it (which last clause brings in your lectures and all controversial matter whatever).

"If you could get two or three good speakers, you could have public meetings in the principal towns. I know this could not be done without a vast deal of spirit, but surely you might find some young men who would carry it out. We were about thirty in age when we began the *Tracts;* have you none of that age? Only they must not speak treason. In particular localities you might get great assistance from a meeting; e.g., I suppose I could get H. Wilberforce to speak here, if there was a meeting. The Oratory ought to have nothing to do with politics, and I would not do any very ecclesiastical subject; but Father Gordon and I would, I dare say, do something, if a sort of club was formed here, though we would not with our engagements dream of managing it.

"Supposing meetings were once a month, consisting of a paper read, etc. The lecturer might be supplied from London or elsewhere, if he could not be found on the spot.

" How many good lecturers and speakers could you collect up and down the country? Northcote, Thompson, yourself, Simpson, etc., etc. The thing would be to keep it from being ecclesiastical, in which case it would fall under the priest of the place, who, if dull, would ruin the whole, and yet with ecclesiastical autho-

rity. The Cardinal surely would take up this *idea* (if practical). The first qualification of a member should be *energy*. If you got six men in London, six in Liverpool, etc., might you not do it? If you could get six men of talent, they at least must be willing simply to put themselves under those who had talent, i.e., for London or elsewhere."

It was in the year 1848—the year when Cardinal Wiseman published his declaration as to the functions of the laity—that the *Rambler* saw the light. The first controversy in which it engaged was on "Rood-screens"; it opposed them in the interest of the modern spirit of the Church and of the new popular devotions. For years its pages were filled with articles in this spirit; it printed series of essays on devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, on celebrated sanctuaries of the Madonna and on the pilgrimage to La Salette. It was lavish in its admiration of Father Faber's Hymnology, St Alfonso Liguori's *Glories of Mary* and the Oratorian *Lives of Modern Saints*.

The definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1854 led to some letters in the *Rambler* in July, 1855, and in May and July, 1856, on Original Sin and the destiny of the unregenerate. At the end of the last-named number there is a statement that the Cardinal-Archbishop had commissioned a certain number of theologians to examine the doctrines put forward in the letter of May, and a declaration on the part of the writer of his submission to whatever censure might be the result. The number for September, 1856, however, contains the notice that the writer of the letter, feeling

with regret that there are certain statements which appear to require a revision, withdraws from the discussion of the question, and that His Eminence thereupon does not consider it necessary to proceed with the examination. What these "certain statements" may be readers are not informed; they may be fundamental positions, they may be only illustrations. But they would seem not to be the former, for in spite of the notice just quoted the whole theory of the letters is editorially and somewhat vehemently reasserted in the May number for 1858.*

To understand the difficult position created by the general trend of the *Rambler* it is almost necessary to refer as briefly as possible to what may be called the long duel between it and the Cardinal. In October, 1856—that is in the next number after the *Rambler* had withdrawn the discussion on "Original Sin" to which reference has just been made—there appeared among the short notices a petulant article, clearly directed against the Cardinal personally, complaining of the necessity of observing silence and of being warned off the discussion of serious topics. The line of argument required of it, it says, is one that, whilst showing up the enemies of the faith as both absurd and wicked, endeavours to make out by a set of garbled quotations how all the sciences of the nineteenth century are demonstrating the truth of the ultramontane views of politics, history and scientific truth. The notice was made even more pointed by part of it being a parody of a sentence from an article, very probably by the Cardinal, in the *Dublin Review;* and the Cardinal lost no time in reply-

* p. 345.

ing to it. In the *Dublin* for January, 1857, an article appeared on "The Present Catholic Dangers," in which the *Rambler* was treated with a considerable amount of mock irony, and a scarcely fair use was made of an expression to fix upon it the charge of trying to divide Catholics into parties.

This article was replied to in a very feeble manner in the *Rambler* for February. Instead of treating it as the work of a mere reviewer, the writer of the reply insisted upon seeing in it, no doubt correctly, the hand of the Cardinal, and declared himself precluded on account of the dignity of the writer from answering the strictures passed upon it. In the next number, however, an article appeared with the title, "Literary Cookery," which is the real reply to the *Dublin*. "We don't want," says the writer, "to prove Protestants rogues, so much as to force them to see that we Catholics are neither cowards nor tricksters, but possess our full share of courage and truth-telling. . ."* "We have to encounter the belief that we are not only crafty and false, but actually afraid of the truth's being known. This belief has to be vanquished, not by an angry denial of its justice, not by taunts, not by *braggadocio*, but by proving our courage by our acts. It is useless to proclaim that history and science are in harmony with our religion, unless we show that we think so by being ourselves foremost in telling the whole truth about the Church and about her enemies."†

Though the writer of the article abstains from any personal allusions to the Cardinal, and even goes out of his way to recommend a new and revised edition

* *Rambler*, March 1857, p. 166. † p. 168.

of the lectures on *Science and Revealed Religion*, it is impossible not to see under the ridicule which he throws on the mosaic geology of M. Nicolas and the authors whom he quotes, a reference to those very lectures, which are largely quoted by His Eminence, and for the very error for which he is ridiculed.

For a time matters rested here. In May, 1857, the *Rambler* published a letter about the "Controversy on the Poor School Grant," against the known tendencies of the episcopal portion of the Poor School Committee, and in spite of the Cardinal's declaration in the *Dublin Review* of January, 1857, that education was one of those questions on which the spirit of party might be excited and which was therefore not a matter for free discussion by the laity.* Nevertheless the *Rambler* continued at intervals to discuss the question throughout 1857 and 1858, till, early in 1859, it was obliged, in consequence of episcopal pressure brought to bear upon the proprietors through Cardinal Newman, to come to a sudden halt and to begin afresh in new hands.

In September, 1857, the *Rambler* published another article on "Converts and Old Catholics," in which it thus adverted to the controversies it was engaged in: "We have been occasionally found fault with in public—and of course what is made public indicates the private opinion of at least one real person—for stepping out of our province and criticizing when we have no right to interfere. In the cases referred to we have generally been prompted to the course we have adopted by the very authorities on whose exclu-

* p. 445.

sive rights we have been supposed to encroach. The freedom of remark which we have adopted as a matter of principle has found its chief opponents among converts and its warmest supporters among old Catholics. And though, now and then, some person considers that we are going too far, the general body of Catholics, both clerical and lay, have too much good sense to be permanently offended because something is now and then written which they do not approve or for which there may be motives which do not appear on the surface."*

From this time there was a pause in the controversy till the publication of Cardinal Wiseman's *Last Four Popes* in March, 1858, which was reviewed in the *Rambler* for April. Out of this article arose a controversy on the alleged cardinalate of Lingard, and the Cardinal thought it necessary to answer Canon Tierney's letter in the *Rambler* for June, 1858, in a special letter addressed to his priests. In the August number† there was a sentence, "Because St Augustine was the greatest doctor of the West, we need not conceal the fact that he was also the father of Jansenism." This bold expression gave great offence, which was not lessened by an elaborate defence of its truth in the December number from the pen, it was understood, of Dr Döllinger. This defence was attacked in pamphlets and letters to the Catholic newspapers.

In 1859 the *Rambler* again entered upon the educational controversy, and in February it replied to criticisms in the *Tablet*. To this matter it will be necessary to return later, and here it need only be noted that the

* *Rambler*, xx, p. 226. † p. 135.

controversy led to a cessation of the monthly form of the magazine; the publication was suspended for three months, and it then appeared in May, 1859, as a bi-monthly periodical, under the management of Newman.

In 1861 the *Rambler* admitted a letter by Mr H. N. Oxenham, signed X.Y.Z., on the subject of secondary education given in Catholic colleges. A lengthy correspondence ensued, in which Canon Oakeley and Dr Ward took part. It is in some respects worth reading still, but at the time the publication of the original letter was strongly resented. What was meant as suggestion for improvement, or at most for helpful criticism, was taken as only ill-natured reflections upon the existing state of things, and here also bad blood was generated, although there were persons of influence and standing among the older clergy who warmly approved of Mr Oxenham's endeavour to call attention to what was amiss. Even the late Dr W. G. Ward, although entirely opposed to what he supposed to be the *Rambler's* position in the controversy on other grounds, wrote to Mr Simpson at the time as follows:

"Amidst the differences which I recognize between the *Rambler* and myself (specially, if you will allow me to say so, between your contributions to it and myself) I am extremely grateful to you and it for many things. First, you have been bold enough to face much obloquy in refusing to 'bow the knee to Baal,' to join in the most disgusting chorus of self-laudation, which is the present fashion. I cannot indeed think your 'croaking' at all up to mark; but it is refreshing to hear the 'croaking' at all Secondly,

I think the *Rambler* has been *the only publication* which has shown the most distant perception as to the immense intellectual work incumbent on us, in both theology and philosophy. Even your contributions on 'Original Sin'—though I doubt if they contained two consecutive sentences in which I could concur—yet did this most important service (in my humble opinion): that they opened the way into a new ground which it is absolutely essential that we Catholics should occupy. Thirdly, I very much wish to have some talk with you on matters philosophical. I am most deeply convinced that the whole philosophical fabric which occupies our colleges is rotten from the roof to the floor (or rather from the floor to the roof). Nay, no one who has not been mixed up practically in a seminary would imagine to how great an extent it *intellectually debauches* the students' minds. At least *we* agree that all these questions are most momentously important."

Varied as were the subjects dealt with in the yearly volumes of the *Rambler*, the ready appeal to the modern spirit involved ideas which every now and then found expression and showed unmistakably that the writers proceeded on principles and grounds which would equally serve for the foundation of contradictory judgements with a little more knowledge and a little longer experience. Its protestations of independence have already been quoted. In an early volume we find the editor claiming for all Catholics "that unbiassed liberty of following after truth at all costs, which is the inalienable privilege and the bounden duty of every creature endowed with the great gift of

reason."* One feature, which may be traced throughout its career, is a disposition to exult over the diversity of Catholic thought on all things beyond matters of faith and to deny any necessary subordination of the laity to the clergy in their opinions on matters of general interest. It even glories in this attitude, which it holds to be essential for the mental development and progress of the Catholic mind. We shall always differ, it proclaims, as long as we are good for anything. Indeed, even while the feelings of the conductors were engaged on the side of the then modern devotional system of Rome, the *Rambler* every now and then exhibited a tendency to pare down speculative doctrines as pious opinions. In 1850, for example, it seemed to limit the rights of the Church in the interpretation of Scripture, and asserted a duration of the world which, although it would probably have passed quite unnoticed in these days, must then have appeared scandalous to Mosaic geologists.† Occasion even was taken of the definition of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma of the Church to inquire what were the scantiest possible views of Original sin and eternal punishment compatible with the defined doctrines of the Church.

For these and other reasons upon which it is unnecessary to enter the *Rambler* certainly succeeded in making itself an object of anxiety to the ecclesiastical authorities. This is not wonderful when it is remembered that its policy was very different, if not in some ways contrary, to that laid down some years before by Cardinal Wiseman for the conductors of a lay review.

* Vol. IV, p. 163. † Vol. VI, p. 197 seq.; and in 1855, vol. XVI, p. 25.

In another matter also "its spirit" gave great offence, and under the circumstances most naturally. The year 1845 saw the first of that great flood of conversions to Rome which was only stayed by the agitation of the "Papal Aggression." With it the first decade of the *Dublin Review* came to an end. When it closed, the *Review* in summing up its past career said that its controversial period was over; that a new epoch had come in its history; and that it saw opening before it fields for labours more agreeable, more varied, and no less interesting to its readers.* What these proved to be it is beyond the present inquiry to determine. In one point, however, it is necessary to remark that the *Dublin* and the *Rambler* were conducted upon lines wholly divergent. In historical matters the policy of the *Dublin* appears to have been to avoid, as far as possible, facing unpleasant facts in the past and to explain away, if it could not directly deny, the existence of "blots" in the ecclesiastical annals of the older centuries. The *Rambler*, on the other hand, held the view that the Church had nothing to lose and much to gain by meeting facts as they were. And acting up to this it did not hesitate to discuss the conduct of the Popes of the Renaissance and the characters of canonised saints, etc., with entire freedom, on the ground that no supreme office nor assured sanctity was an *a priori* proof of impeccability, and that it should not shield the one class or the other from legitimate criticism. It taunted all those who would attempt, for example, the rehabilitation of "bad popes," and would desire that all should shut their eyes to the unpleasant facts of

* Dec. 1845, p. 545.

Church history, as being plain "whitewashers." It placed them upon the same historical level as Mr James Anthony Froude, who was then attempting his rehabilitation of Henry VIII. They even insinuated that such writers were acting on the very same principle as Froude was, namely, "that a good work proves a good workman." The *Rambler* thus came into distinct opposition to the *Dublin Review*, not only in point of circulation among the small body of Catholics, but likewise on principles of conduct.

It has been necessary to speak somewhat at length about the *Rambler* and the views of those that supported it in order to understand the origin of the difficulties which beset its conduct, and which were already in existence when the first letters printed in this volume were written. It is impossible to deny that in many ways, rather perhaps by the irritating tone in which delicate matters were spoken of than by much that was actually said, the *Rambler* gave cause to the English ecclesiastical authorities to regard it as an *enfant terrible*. Looking back after half a century it is possible to see that many of the opinions which, when expressed by the *Rambler*, called forth the strong condemnation of many Catholics in the public journals, and in some instances remonstrances and threats from the authorities, would pass to-day without remark. Times have changed, and we with them; and many of the strong things that were then said and many of the aspirations that were then uttered, say upon the thorny subject of higher Catholic education, have been settled. So, too, on the theological points raised in certain articles written by Mr Richard Simpson in the *Rambler*,

the loud protests of certain theologians at the time seem half to discredit his true Catholicity. Yet it is not uninteresting now to know that in reality his opinions were shared by many ecclesiastics of weight, who did not care to come out into the open, and left upon him the brunt of the battle.

On a calm review of all the circumstances it seems as if, in regard to the controversy about the *Rambler*, as in so many cases, the whole might have been avoided with just a little better understanding on both sides. But here precisely was the difficulty: the parties never did and never could look at the matters from each other's standpoint, and in great measure this arose from the nature of things. Though the *Rambler* cannot be said to be the representative of the convert element, yet the ideas it propagated came into the Catholic body with and through the converts; and converts with lapse of time had come to discover the real state of things in the body they had joined, and were perhaps at times piqued or irritated at the policy of *couleur de rose* which had been adopted almost officially. They were impatient at what they considered the need of education and the want of spirit which they saw in the English Catholic body. No doubt to a great extent they were right: for half a century and more the Catholics of England had been deprived by the French Revolution of even that measure of higher education which during three centuries of penal law they had found at Douai and at the other universities of France. Thrown back upon themselves, they had done what was possible under the circumstances to carry on the Douai traditions of clerical training; but the

lack of the incentive of public competition was sufficient to cause them in time to fall behind in the race, and their isolation made them perhaps too contented with the existing state of things. In one sense it was their glory and their misfortune, not their shame, for it was part of the penalty they paid for fidelity to the faith.

Converts coming fresh from the universities were unprepared for this; and the two parties seemed for a time at least incapable of understanding each other: the one did not realise its shortcomings, the other failed to make the necessary allowances for defects that were not the fault of those in whom they existed. But there were matters of form that accentuated the differences arising from divergencies of view; this cause for aggravation dates from the quite early days of the *Rambler*. It was known that some of the most irritating articles were written by converts who, it was (rightly or wrongly) felt, were assuming a tone of superiority, whilst certainly, however zealous in their designs or however good their intention, they were only neophytes. On the other hand, these new comers were genuinely unprepared for the strength of language and vituperation which was adopted by their fellow Catholics in their regard. One of them writing in 1849 says that, "compared with other classes and religious bodies, Catholics attack one another with a virulence, an uncharitableness, a reckless imputation of motives and an ungentlemanly coarseness of language, which can be paralleled in no other society professing to be guided by religious principles and to be restrained by the laws of common propriety."* And twenty years

* *Rambler*, August, 1849, vol. IV, p. 231.

later the *Saturday Review* called attention to this peculiar characteristic of Catholic internal controversy. "The curious in polemics," the writer says, "will be well rewarded for his trouble if he will turn over the pages of Roman Catholic newspapers, reviews and magazines of the last fifteen or twenty years. It is clear from the extraordinary freedom with which names and persons are handled, and from the eagerness of bishops and dignitaries to enter into the lists, that an amount of pugnacity exists among Roman Catholics, which by no means finds a [sufficient] vent in onslaughts on Protestantism."*

One natural tendency of this style of polemics was to strain to the snapping point the relations between the men of the *Rambler* school and the authorities of the Catholic Church in England. Unfortunately the former did not always realise the importance of subordination in doubtful and difficult matters to those in whose hands the ecclesiastical government ultimately rested, or the imperative need, for the sake of peace and the welfare of the Church, whose interests after all they had really and only at heart, to avoid topics calculated to give offence or cause misunderstanding. This in the eyes of many seemed in practice to bring with it intellectual stagnation, or indeed to render impossible the treatment of any subject of real intellectual interest. Above all, in spite of the insistence of Newman that all theological questions should be avoided, some of the writers, and notably Simpson,† to whom most of the letters in this

* *Saturday Review*, August 16, 1862.

† Simpson's attitude will be best understood from a letter written to his real friend, Bishop Grant, of Southwark. In 1862, when the conversion of

volume were addressed, could not refrain sometimes at least from entering upon the domain of theology. This brilliant writer, in many ways undoubtedly one of the ablest of the converts, has thus appeared to many an enigma, to some in past days a scandal, and he is still not infrequently treated as a scapegoat. No one who really knew him, or has been through his papers and letters, could doubt that in reality he was a true and fervent Catholic. He was daily at holy Mass, and he constantly frequented the sacraments. Whilst some even highly-placed ecclesiastics shrugged their shoulders at *La Salette*, Simpson simply believed in the apparition. He was exceptionally charitable to those in need. Whenever any one, no matter who it might be, was in trouble, he was as concerned and as anxious to help as if it had been his nearest and dearest friend. In numberless ways he gave practical proof that he truly loved his neighbour as himself. He was misunderstood by many; but it is impossible not to confess

the *Rambler* into the quarterly *Home and Foreign Review* had been settled, he wrote to the bishop: "You will be very glad to hear that some time ago the *We* of the *Rambler* had determined on 'converting' it—not perhaps as will satisfy Coffin, but with a conversion that I hope will be enough to do away with the weightiest objections that have been made against us. When we publish our first quarterly number in July, you will see that a considerable change has taken place in the editorial department; and if free discussion takes place in the communicated department, it will not be our fault if only one school of opinion is represented. As to your advice about not touching on theological matters, it is the same as Dr Newman has urged upon me before and again lately, and it is advice that I try to observe. But all my studies have been on subjects that have some slight relation to theology—politics, metaphysics and physical science—and it is very difficult, all but impossible, for me to keep off the tabooed territory; and the more I try, the more I fail. I thought I was progressing that way; and lo, Wenham and Allies are disgusted with me for ignoring the supernatural, and Marshall (if he is (*im*)*pudens*) accuses me of infidelity. See what I get by keeping out of theology."

that the misunderstanding was mainly the result of his own methods. His transparent sincerity, his ready forgiveness of injuries, and his freedom from all animosity against those who bullied and slandered him, seem worthy of notice here.

He was a man endowed with fair health and with an exceptional share of the good temper that arises from this; in fact there remained in him a strain of almost boyish fun and love of mischief. As Acton wrote to him in April, 1859 (Lett. xxxiv): "If Döllinger were certain that the effervescence of your conversation would not communicate itself to your ink, he would consider that nobody can give as just information and as discriminating judgements as you can on things religious and secular in England." He had the gift—the fatal gift it may be called in the circumstances—of catching the comical side of serious matters, which made him not always a respecter of persons in authority, accustomed to look for reverence and obedience. His general robustness of temperament made him not averse to the disturbance arising from dispute, whilst, when he was seriously engaged in a contest, his brilliant intellectual endowments and mental acumen, brought by the urgency of the crisis to bear seriously on the subject in discussion, rendered him eminently displeasing as a professed antagonist. By nature he loved to "tease," but certainly not to hurt; and some ecclesiastics, especially some dignified ecclesiastics, seemed to possess a special power of evoking in him this peculiar spirit. But it is to be added that these efforts were often confined to manuscript, and were reserved for the delectation of

his friends, and found their way into print less often than has sometimes been supposed. Still, in a small and narrow society, like that of the English Catholics of the middle of the last century, everything—even what was "private"—easily and quickly became public property, and much was put down to Simpson's account for which he was not rightly responsible.

Simpson on more than one occasion tried to put matters right with the authorities. In 1858, for example, Cardinal Wiseman misunderstood the action of the *Rambler* in printing a letter from Canon Tierney against himself, in regard to the question of Lingard's "Cardinal's Hat." The expression, "we willingly print," appended by the editor to the letter, gave Wiseman the impression that the *Rambler* was against him, whereas as a fact the conductors of the magazine were with him in his contention. Mr Simpson, as editor, wrote to endeavour to put matters right, and after explaining the facts, he goes on to say:

"I regret very much indeed that the idea should have got abroad that the *Rambler* is conducted in a spirit of personal opposition to your Eminence, and that persons should busy themselves in picking out sentences from nearly every number, which they distort and interpret after their sinister fashion to widen a breach that unfortunately exists. I protest to your Eminence, as I have had occasion to protest to others who have reported these interpretations, that they were not intended, and that any impertinent reference to your Eminence was far removed from the ideas both of the writers and of the editor.

"The *Rambler* has been independent from the first,

and it will remain so. But the proprietors do not consider that independence means personal opposition to you. They know that you are the head and representative in England of the religion which they defend and profess, and that any systematic opposition to you, so far from being real independence, would be only a slavery to passion and to an un-Catholic idea.

"The *Rambler* only claims the liberty of saying what it thinks of measures and men, so far as its thoughts are not inconsistent with faith and discipline, and looks to authority to protect it in its rights against ignorance and dogmatic tyranny, which are continually on the watch to fix the brand of heresy or suspicion on things which would never have been published unless they had been previously sanctioned, or at least pronounced to be within the limits of orthodoxy, by sufficient theologians."

As one of Simpson's correspondents, who knew him well and had personal experience, writes to him in 1858: "I think people's notions of you are most unjust. I fancy I have always had the credit of being *more* prudent, etc., than you, while really I have *meant* what people would have disliked much more than you have meant." It was to Mr Simpson, however, that the "wrong-headedness" of the *Rambler* was at the time very generally ascribed, and during his lifetime he never attempted to shift from his shoulders the responsibility for certain writings with which he was credited, and which are still supposed to be his.*

* M. l'Abbé Dimnet in *La Pensée Catholique dans l'Angleterre Contemporaine*, 1906, p. 65, writes: "Ces écrivains, presque tous anglicans

A remarkable letter, written by Dr W. G. Ward in February, 1859, to Simpson, shows that, in part at least, the latter had the deep sympathy of some who were generally opposed to him. He writes: "I never expected to hear without lively pleasure of the *Rambler* being brought to an end, but certainly our eminent and Right Rev. Fathers have managed to do the thing in a way which effectually prevents any such feeling. I think there is hardly a convert in England who does not cordially sympathize with the articles on the Royal Commission. It is indeed remarkable from my point of view that they [the bishops] allowed every kind of questionable statement on matters of doctrine, and then come to issue on a mere matter of political prudence. The Church's doctrine may be assailed, but not our judgement on a difficult practical matter.

"Will it not be worth while for you to be extremely careful as to the *comments* you may make in public on this strange procedure? Will not two advantages be gained by such care and self-restraint?

"*First:* and chiefly, that the designs for your own sanctification (which God must have in sending you such a trial) will be really allowed their accomplishment.

"*Secondly:* that the cause itself for which you are rightly anxious will be very much the gainer. The

convertis, avaient pris vis-à-vis des anciens Catholiques un ton de supériorité dédaigneuse, et l'un d'eux, M. Simpson, ne craignait pas de faire à l'occasion la satire du cardinal lui-même. . . C'est alors que Wiseman prit, dans la *Dublin Review*, la défense des anciens Catholiques amèrement et systématiquement insultés." I have already pointed out that Simpson was not the author of the article referred to, but the late Provost Wenham.

right of a Catholic layman's independent thought is so important an object of struggle that it seems ten thousand pities if its advocate makes any obvious moral mistake."

The reference in the above letter to the "Royal Commission" and the sympathy conveyed by Ward to Simpson in regard to the articles in the *Rambler* upon it, require some explanation, especially as the misunderstanding created by the latter caused a change in the editorship of the magazine. Early in the session of 1858 Parliament consented to the appointment of a Royal Commission which was to review the whole system of the education of the poor in England. At the time any communication between the Government and the Catholic Church in this country for several reasons was difficult to be conducted by the bishops in person; the law did not recognise them, and made the assumption of their titles penal. Now though the law was never seriously intended, or was intended solely to strengthen the hands of an unscrupulous party leader by an appeal to the social prejudices of a vast class of Englishmen, it was not possible for the Government to open communications with the very persons whom they had put under a ban. It was found most convenient, therefore, to appoint a committee consisting partly of clergymen, partly of the most influential Catholic laymen, with a lay chairman, to be the organ of communication between the bishops and the Government, and to represent the secular interests that must always be combined with so mixed a subject as education.

Among the duties of the Catholic Poor School

Committee not the least was that of watching all the relations between the Government and Catholics in matters of education. Its functions in this regard were deputed to a sub-committee the members of which, in some unexplained way, failed to notice the appointment of the Royal Commission, or to comprehend its nature when at last they awoke to the fact of its existence. They saw only a breach of faith on the part of the Goverment and an insidious attempt to force upon Catholics Protestant inspectors and the religious examination of Catholic children by Protestants. The bishops took alarm: they first demanded that the Commission, which had been appointed by the Queen and had already matured its plans, should be dissolved and reconstructed with the addition of the chairman of the Catholic Poor School Committee. When this was refused, they asked that a Catholic sub-commissioner might be appointed: this also was refused. Whereupon, without any more consideration of possibilities, Catholics were directed not to have any further communication whatever with the Commission or the Government. When this action became known, it caused dismay among the laity generally, and it was at this time that the two articles appeared in the *Rambler* for January and February, 1859. They were written by Mr S. N. Stokes, who had been the first secretary of the Poor School Committee, and the one man to whom its organisation was due, and who at this time was the Catholic School Inspector, and might be supposed to know what he was writing about. The articles gave great offence, as appearing

to trench upon the episcopal prerogatives. Publicity and discussion were deprecated, and the *Rambler* was, in the words of Mr Simpson quoted above, "taken out of [my] hands by Wiseman, Ullathorne and Grant." A letter contributed by Father Formby to the *Register* newspaper attributes its "collapse" to its articles on the Commission, whilst Cardinal Wiseman's Lenten Pastoral clearly indicates the *Rambler* when he speaks of "the enemy choosing [education] for the field in which to sow the tares of division amongst Catholics," and deplores that "any one should endeavour to lead you astray from the simple path of right and dutiful feeling on a matter so obviously belonging to ecclesiastical authority."

When the news that the *Rambler* was to be continued became public, Dr Ward wrote to Simpson: "Who is to be the new editor? I hope you won't think me insensible as to the extremity of injustice with which you have been visited, because on your statement it is very extreme. I cannot help fancying the possibility of some misconception in the latter point: i.e., the breach of covenant [in the publication of pastorals]. Do you mean they are still going to issue a joint pastoral against the defunct *Rambler?*... Things seem to me tending to a kind of union of converts against ecclesiastical authorities. I think, e.g., Newman and Faber will be brought far more together if this sort of thing goes on." And two days later, on March 3, 1859, when Simpson had informed him that Newman was going to issue the *Rambler* as a bi-monthly, Ward writes: "I shall be most deeply inte-

rested to see how J. H. N. develops himself in the *R.* God grant all may turn to good: it looks bad enough as to our governors."

Newman's editorship lasted a very short time. In point of fact he never intended that it should be anything more than a temporary expedient to get over the existing difficulty. He subsequently declared that he had made up his mind in May, 1859, to retire from the post of editor on the publication of the July number.* In a letter to Mr Wetherell, written on July 17, 1859, he writes: "I undertook the charge in order to set it off, and intended and bargained that my continuing it should depend on a variety of circumstances. I very soon found it was impossible, and other circumstances co-operated; and the first number had not been out many weeks when I told the proprietors that the July number would be my last." Thus two numbers only came to be edited from Birmingham. In the second, the July issue, the future Cardinal's article, "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," caused surprise and, in some quarters, consternation; it was even denounced to the Holy See, by Bishop Brown of Newport, as dangerous doctrine. Consultation with Bishop Ullathorne hastened the fulfilment of Newman's previous resolution not to edit another number.

The *Rambler* was handed back to its proprietors, and with Newman's approval and encouragement Mr Wetherell, who had had no relations with the magazine prior to Newman's editorship, became joint editor with Sir John Acton, whilst Simpson, as

* Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning*, II, p. 336.

he himself put it, occupied the place of "an exceptionally privileged contributor." In writing to encourage Wetherell to accept the post, Newman tells him that "to take trouble about it would be simply an act of merit, as proceeding from a wish to serve the Catholic cause in England," and he adds: "I think you will find yourself able to give your confidence to Sir John Acton, the editor. I am sure he wishes to keep clear of what is likely to give offence to Catholics, and has no wish to make the *Rambler* the organ of a party." Then, after saying that he hopes that the editors have been able to gather round them a distinguished band of writers, Newman adds that he rejoices to understand that the subjects to be treated in the magazine "are to be mainly political and literary—and religion will not be introduced except in such occasional articles and with that external treatment which characterizes the *Quarterly Review*"; and he concludes by declaring that in his opinion "it seemed a great point, if possible, to raise the standard of our Catholic literature. Nor do I see a better way of doing it than by a well-conducted periodical."

It has been pointed out that when Newman retired from the editorship of the *Rambler*, after his very brief rule, Acton undertook the editorship with Mr Wetherell as his colleague. Simpson stood aside in theory; but in practice, owing to Acton's occupations and rather frequent absences from England and Mr Wetherell's disablement from time to time by pressure of official work at the War Office, he, as part-proprietor of the magazine and in the position of an "exceptionally privileged contributor," occupied the

post of *locum tenens* for the unavailable editor. The letters here printed show that he was consulted upon all literary matters, and wrote almost what he liked, although he afterwards complained of being sometimes left out in the practical working of the magazine under the new conditions. "I got down to lighten the coach," he writes to Acton, "and it has driven on, leaving me behind and not quite knowing where I am."

Newman continued to take a considerable interest in the fortunes of the magazine after his retirement. He promised to contribute to its columns, and he did so, but not to the extent that the conductors had been led to suppose, or at least had hoped.* He excused himself on the plea of overwork and poor health, but said that apart from that he could not continue to write in the *Rambler*, if other priests did not. He had made this a condition with Acton, and had specially named the Bollandist de Buck, Gratry and the Abbé Maret, of whom the first-named only was ever an actual contributor. Moreover, as he writes on November 13, 1859, a page of the last *Rambler* had pained him "a good deal." "On page 14," he writes, "a comment or interpretation is made in two notes on the synodal letter with a 'venture to suggest' and a 'presume.' This seems to me highly indecorous. Putting altogether aside the style of it, the mere fact of interpreting a synodal letter in a magazine, when the bishops are alive, present

* The position of Newman in regard to the *Rambler* was not very clear. On July 22, 1859, he wrote to Simpsom: "The printer has written to me that the proofs of the *Rambler* have been sent me by your direction. I do not feel I can accept your kind wish about them, and have thought best not to read a line of them" (*Life of Cardinal Manning*, II, 336).

and in an authoritative place, to *recur* to, and to *ask, as to* their meaning, seems to me a great mistake."*

Apart from this instance of what Newman considered bad form and an unjustifiable slight put upon the ecclesiastical authorities, he thought the number of the magazine excellent. "I am very much pleased with it," he writes. "It contains a great variety of subjects, a great deal of thought and much careful composition. It is so good a number that I think it must make its way."

As time went on, the opinion of Dr Newman as to the wrong-headedness of the line taken by the *Rambler* became even more definite. In 1861 he wrote to Mr Wetherell again excusing himself for standing aloof from a literary effort in which he much sympathised, and said that his health would not allow him to do so even "though I saw my way ever so clearly to approve of the steps which the proprietors of the *Rambler* have taken of late; but, to tell the truth, I have not been able to follow them for several months. . . I think they are in a false position; but as this is a matter which concerns them specially, I do not say more about it here."

The magazine continued as a bi-monthly till 1862, when after the April number it was determined to transform it into a quarterly review The advice of Dr Newman was sought before any final decision was arrived at, but he replied on March 21, 1862, to

* It was at this time that a communication appeared in the *Weekly Register* (November 16, 1859) denying that Dr Newman had any "part in conducting or superintending that able periodical." This was sent to the paper in consequence of a previous reference to Newman "as editor of the *Rambler*," etc.

Mr Wetherell as follows: "I do not find myself in a position to be of any use in advising you and Sir John Acton on any question connected with the *Rambler*. The truth is, I have already expressed the conclusion to which I have come that, in spite of the great talent with which it is conducted, it lies under conditions which, as it seems to me, render the prospect of its usefulness hopeless. Not to state any other condition, I think its name has by this time such associations that the public mind cannot be fair to it. Let it change its external appearance or its constituent parts ever so much, its name gives it an identity."*

The determination to change the form of the magazine was ultimately arrived at in view of the fact that the tone of the articles published in it on the Temporal Power of the Pope was much disliked in Rome and by the authorities in England. The principles which actuated Simpson during the years of his editorship and subsequently may perhaps be best understood from a letter written by him on the *Rambler* question to his bishop, Dr Grant of Southwark, on April 23, 1862, when the conversion of the magazine into the *Home and Foreign Review* had already been determined upon. He says:

"I wish simply to try and show what were my intentions, and what are and have been my reasons for writing as I do.

* For previous communications about the magazine, see letters in *Life of Cardinal Manning*, II, pp. 332-338. To Acton, Newman wrote on June 20, 1860: "I am exceedingly desirous of the success of the *Rambler*, and to contribute to it as much as I can; but I cannot undertake to be theological censor, nor can I give my name to it, unless it had a responsible editor and the countenance of such theologians as I have mentioned above."

"Brought up as I was, I have no other resource but literature, and being a Catholic I cannot help writing as a Catholic—in matters defined, taking the one side defined; in doubtful matters, choosing my side according to my convictions, and trying to recommend my opinion to others. I am convinced that in what I have ever written I have not gainsaid any definition of the Church, nor gone beyond the liberty permitted to all Catholics in doubtful points. If I have, I retract it and will retract it. And I am convinced also that, in spite of many blunders and follies, the general line I have taken is one that is supremely necessary for the course of truth.

"I have written in a journal which deals necessarily with public topics, and cannot handle the private spiritual concerns of individuals, and so cannot lead men to contrition and penance—a journal which is not theological, and so cannot deal directly with matters of faith. It is only left to me to try and take the side of faith by defending the truth, and by proving that a man may be sincerely Catholic and may defend his religion without *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi*, and to try and take the side of charity by an objective and dispassionate way of writing, which does not attack the person, but only discusses the opinion. . .

"I am certain that the cessation of the *Rambler*, or its change,* would do great harm to the Catholic cause in England. I know, for I have experienced the thing, that the great prejudice against the Church among educated Englishmen is not a religious one against her dogmas, but an ethical and political one; they

*i.e., change in principles or spirit.

think that no Catholic can be truthful, honest or free, and that if he tries to be so publicly he is at once subject to persecution. The existence of the *Rambler* is more or less a reply to this prejudice; and we bear all that is said and done against us in silence rather than make any public complaint about the dirty ways in which different parties have, at different times, tried to crush us, in order not to create any scandal."

Perhaps in the earlier days of his connexion with the *Rambler* Simpson saw less clearly than some of his friends the direct conflict of underlying principles involved in the current disputes. But when once he had realised this fully, he withdrew from the treatment of specifically Catholic subjects and collaboration in Catholic periodicals altogether, and acted upon the view (as he wrote in January, 1875) that "our only way of speaking to the nation was in the midst of controversies like this in papers like the *Times*."

The *Home and Foreign Review*, a quarterly, first appeared in July, 1862, with Acton as editor. In the prospectus the scope of the venture in succession to the *Rambler* is thus explained:

"It will abstain from direct theological discussion as far as external circumstances will allow; and in dealing with those mixed questions into which theology indirectly enters, its aim will be to combine devotion to the Church with discrimination and candour in the treatment of her opponents; to reconcile freedom of inquiry with implicit faith; and to discountenance what is untenable and unreal without forgetting the tenderness due to the weak, or the reverence

rightly claimed for what is sacred. Submitting without reserve to infallible authority, it will encourage a habit of manly investigation on subjects of scientific interest."

These sentences were taken, almost verbatim, from Newman's prospectus for the bi-monthly *Rambler;* and the programme was practically that of the *Rambler*, as explained in several of the articles published in that magazine at various times. The need of some such studies and the principle upon which they were undertaken were, for example, thus stated in 1861: "In intellectual encounters the Church and the world must always use the same weapons; they must argue upon the common principles of reason, and assume the same universally accepted truths. In her battle with successive schools of philosophy she has ever fought with their arms."*

The principle appears sound and simple enough; but the difficulty lies in the practical application; and especially in the concrete case of historical investigation and criticism. Already in 1857 the *Rambler* had uttered the word of warning: "A prophet if he wishes his predictions of the future to be credited, should be careful not to show *ignorance of the present and the past;* for if he talks nonsense about subjects that we know, how shall we believe him when he talks about that which we understand not?"† In 1861 the *Rambler* came to state the concrete case; the difficulty which was actually beginning to press at the time. "It is slovenly logic," it said, "to argue that because Suarez,

* *Rambler*, new (third) series, v, p. 339, 1861.
† *Rambler*, new series, viii, p. 150.

Petavius or à Lapide were good divines they were also competent authorities in physical science. If students in theology are forced to suck in the theories which ages of ignorance have foisted on Moses, when they have to work as clergymen they will have to experience in their own persons the way in which Church and Scripture have been exposed to the contempt of intelligent infidels, who, after hearing divines teaching physical falsehoods as Bible truths, have mocked at the same men when they claimed credence for Biblical faith and morals; for most people have at least Biblical knowledge enough to be aware that those who are found unfaithful in what men can see are not to be believed when they speak of heavenly things that men cannot see."*

But it was felt that really it was on the subject of history which touched ordinary living men at so many susceptible points that the battle between the two schools among Catholics in England as elsewhere would have to be fought out. It was felt by the conductors of the *Rambler* all the more keenly inasmuch as they perceived that the divisions then existent in the small body of English Catholics were largely due to misconceptions as to the history of their own past.

An article on "The Catholic Press," in the number for February, 1859, explains the case exactly. It is, indeed, proper to give some extracts from it, as it reads in some respects almost like a programme of the *Home and Foreign Review* a few years later.

"Where our knowledge of events," it says, "is not obscured by time, it is often quite as much distorted

* *Rambler*, third series, v, p. 330.

by partiality. . . . If [our history] were more thoroughly cleared up—the earlier period from the mists of ignorance, the later from the mists of prejudice—it would then be possible to appeal to the experience of English Catholics as a lesson for their present guidance." But we want to know not merely the "the noble and consoling history of the persecutions" but also the less edifying "story of our gradual emancipation." But looking round the writer found that, apart from the great work of Lingard, "if we except certain very elaborate essays in the *Atlantis*, there is hardly anything serious or durable in the productions of the Catholic literature of the day. Entertaining books abound; we have history made edifying, science religious, and religion exceedingly attractive." "But a popular literature cannot stand alone; it must be fed from the overflowings from more serious books. It is incapable of progress or improvement, and, if cultivated to the exclusion of more substantial things, must inevitably degenerate. By itself it . . . promotes a superficial self-contented way of looking at all things, of despising difficulties, and overlooking the force of objections. It nourishes the delusion that we have only to communicate truths, not to discover them; that our knowledge needs no increase except in the number of those who participate in it. . . The consequence is that we have not a half a dozen books which will bear critical examination, or which we are not ashamed of before Protestants and foreigners."*

With the words "critical examination" the writer puts his finger on the chief weakness of literary effort

* p. 75.

among English Catholics in the 'fifties; even the "best" writers were only too easily content with what looked well; and a "critical examination" was only too likely to prove a severe trial for some whose repute stood highest.

"The great object of our literary efforts," the writer continued, "ought to be to break down the Protestant tradition";* but he was conscious that in the measure in which this was effectively performed some other cherished traditions or illusions would have to go along with it. "We need a guide, an example and an authority in literature; and this would be the great purpose which a Review could accomplish. The literary inferiority of Catholics is due to the absence of the will, not of the power to excel. . . The contempt and indifference with which knowledge is often regarded soon engender aversion and dread.†

"There are many venerable people who still refuse to travel by steam; and there are many who cannot reconcile themselves to the alliance of the Church with that secular science which they have accustomed themselves to consider her foe.

"The necessity of waging this double contest, at once with those who are of little faith and with those who have none at all—with those who for the sake of religion fear science, and with the followers of science who despise religion—is the fruitful cause of so much scandal and vexation in the Church. In reality this pretence of antagonism is on neither side sincere. Solicitude for religion is merely a pretext for opposition to the free course of scientific research,

* p. 76. † p. 83

which threatens, not the authority of the Church, but the precarious influence of individuals. The growth of knowledge cannot in the long run be detrimental to religion; but it renders impossible the usurpation of authority by teachers who defend their own false opinions under pretence of defending the faith which they dishonour by their artifices.*

"Instead of acknowledging that the old conflict of doctrine must be decided by the sword of science, and that the urgency of the case requires them to mend their slovenly ways, they content themselves with denouncing those who, by refusing to share in their dishonest practices, make it the more conspicuous and the more unavailing. They impute to others the evils they themselves have caused, and do not see that the progress of error and unbelief is their own work. Partly afraid of the truth, and partly ashamed of it, they want to shelter their own ignorance by preserving that of others. But religion is not served by denying facts, or by denouncing those who proclaim them. A fire is not put out by a policeman's whistle, nor a thief taken by the cry of 'Stop thief!' Truth is not the exclusive possession of the ignorant; the sun does not shine only for the blind. Authority can only condemn error; its vitality is not destroyed until it is refuted.†

"The one thing needful at the present day, when science has made such progress, and has so much perfected its methods as to be far more powerful, whether for friendship or enmity, than ever before in the history of the Church, is to accept it as her necessary and trusty ally... Nothing else can save religion

*p. 84. †p. 85.

from the twin dangers of unbelief and superstition. *Nihil veritas erubescit nisi solummodo abscondi*—'Truth is only ashamed of concealment.'"*

Writing to the American Catholic philosopher Brownson, after the issue of the first number of the *Home and Foreign*, Mr Simpson throws some not uninteresting sidelights upon the designs of the conductors of this new venture. He says:

"We have no easier task here in England than you have in America. Our old families, the Catholic aristocracy, where they cultivate literature, have been so long accustomed to go to the general English literature that they never think of looking for distinctively Catholic books or periodicals except as furniture for their oratories or chapels, and only extend a patronage half contemptuous, half eleemosynary to the efforts of those who would get up a Catholic literature. We are consequently left to the patronage of the lower orders, who are satisfied with a periodical literature of which almost any other religious body would have reason to be ashamed. Our novels are controversial or sentimental, sermons decanted into trashy stories; our social science consists in the depreciation of the intellectual and moral condition of our religious antagonists, and our policy of denunciation of parties is not in proportion to their anti-Catholic principles but to their supposed hostility to measures or combinations which are thought to be conducive to the present interests of the Church. To this democracy we have made ourselves sufficiently obnoxious in our existence as the *Rambler*, without altogether conquering the

* p. 86.

profound indifference of the educated persons who would agree with us if they would read us. These two facts have led us more and more to diminish the religious speciality of the *Rambler* and to bring it into even closer approximation to our old reviews the *Quarterly* and the *Edinburgh*. It professes to compete with them on their own ground, and even in some points to surpass them. You will see that the articles on foreign politics ('Nationality' and the 'Gotha Party') are written by experts. It is chiefly for this foreign department that we wish to secure your invaluable assistance. No man can give so philosophical a view of American politics and history, expressed in so brilliant a style, as you."

The first number of the *Review* appeared in July, 1862, and it ceased in April, 1864; eight quarterly parts in all were published. Each number was divided into three parts: the articles, the notices of books under the title of "Contemporary Literature," and "Current Events." In regards to the articles in the *Home and Foreign* one of the most striking features is that they were mostly contributed by Catholic laymen. The list of those who were associated in the work of the new Review includes the names of Sir P. le Page Renouf, Lord Emly, Judge John O'Hagan, Professor Paley, Sullivan (of the Catholic University, Dublin), Thomas Arnold, Chester Waters, S. N. Stokes, T. F. Wetherell, J. M. Capes, Florence McCarthy, Stevenson, Riley and Edmund Dease, besides, of course, Lord Acton and Simpson. Conjointly these two last produced what in many ways was perhaps the most remarkable article in the whole eight numbers. This

was the paper entitled "Ultramontanism"; it was then a subject little understood historically, and the article may very well be read with profit still.

But it was the second half of each number—the "Notices of Books"—which gives the *Home and Foreign Review* a special place in the history of English periodical literature. It is true that the *Saturday Review* gave its monthly survey of "French" and "German Literature," but these were articles of the type of the more modern professional "reviewer," able of course (as Mark Pattison says in another connexion) to write a *quantum* on any subject with the least possible amount of knowledge of the subject that can colourably suffice. The notices in the *Home and Foreign* were the intermediate stage between the "reviews" now common and the "reviews" of the older style written in what may be called "the grand manner"; that is to say, the review style of the Quarterly reviewer when a review of a book meant an article, often written by a man who knew as much—sometimes more—of the subject than the writer of the book itself. The notices of books in the *Home and Foreign* differ from notices of this kind, since they are and profess to be reviews only in the modern sense; but they are differentiated from the modern "review" inasmuch as they were written by men perfectly competent to appreciate the book "noticed." It was judged by the writer of the notice from personal and independent acquired knowledge of the subject matter for its own sake; by men abreast, not only with the latest literature of the subject, but—what was a mark of singularity in England in those days—with the latest

"improvements" in the methods of criticism. The letters published in this volume are sufficient evidence of the care taken to secure the best possible results in this department of the *Review*. To many, even at the present day, it would probably be a revelation to turn over the pages of the "Contemporary Literature" section in this now almost forgotten *Review*. Here, for instance, is a quotation from the preface of one book noticed. "I have often thought of writing a history of one of our early rulers," says the author, G. Waitz, "based entirely on the words and testimonies of our ancient, i.e., medieval historians, with references, etc., all quite in the learned way in which not a single statement should be true"; and he then goes on to explain the *rationale* of his own procedure, the modern critical method in treatment of texts and historical work which would stand to-day as then as a statement of the best work done in the domain of history. Nowhere else in England at this time was to be found such evidence of true and sound literary scholarship as in the pages of the *Review;* and the interest of the movement lies in the fact that the men who saw all these things, who were alive to them, who looked fairly and squarely at problems which seemed to menace the very foundations of religion, who perceived ahead the difficulties that threatened the faith, yet tried not to obscure them, pooh-pooh them, dismiss them with soft-sounding words, or turn from them in fright, were Roman Catholics. What makes the *Home and Foreign Review* phenomenal is that at that time, now more than forty years ago, it was more solid in the knowledge of German methods and ideas

on all matters than even the *Westminster Review*, and that it was more up to the very latest date in all this than any other periodical then published in England. How this was so may be in part understood by the present Acton letters.

From the first Newman, anxious for the success of the *Review*, had his fears that the *Rambler* spirit would be found to taint the new undertaking, and that in spite of every good resolution to avoid the discussion of dangerous theological subjects in its pages, somehow or other this fertile source of difficulty and misunderstanding would continue to crop up. When consulted as to the proposed conversion of the *Rambler* into the quarterly *Home and Foreign Review* he had declined to advise. But he was favourable to the proposed change; and upon the appearance of the first number of the *Home and Foreign* he wrote to Mr Wetherell, one of the editors, expressing his amazement at "the resources, vigour and industry" which were conspicuous in the new *Review*. He wished it every success from his heart, and "among these successes, for which I wish and pray, and for which I have before now said Mass, of course the foremost is, that, by its soundness and prudence in treating matters quasi-religious and cognate to religion, it may obtain the approbation and confidence of our bishops."

The second number of the *Review* was published in October, and almost immediately Newman wrote the following letter to Mr Wetherell:

"*October* 6, 1862.

"The *Home and Foreign* has been sent me here [Deal], and I have read the article on the Cardinal's reply with great interest. I shall be very anxious to hear what is thought of it, and perhaps you will have the kindness to bear to hear what *I* think of it. I say this, knowing how easy it is to criticize anything, and feeling you have an abundance of kind friends to favour you with their remarks and advice.

"Every one, I think, must be struck with the excellence of its tone. It is both generous and candid: generous towards the Cardinal, and candid, manly, modest and moderate as regards the *Rambler*. It is clear, moreover, in the exposition of its own principles, and in explaining the *Rambler's* position in the Catholic community. And it is well-written.

"These are great excellences. As far as it goes, it must do good, and perhaps it could not go further than it does. It may be that to have attempted more would have been to effect less; or at least to lose one way what was gained in another.

"I am disposed to except from these remarks the wording of the paragraph, pp. 514, 515, beginning 'Learning, etc.' I fear it will be read thus: 'Among the writers of this eminent but short-sighted school, of course, we reckon our illustrious Cardinal. Without derogating from the great merits which we have ascribed to him, we take this opportunity of insinuating that, in his controversial writings, he has never been more than a 'brilliant rhetorician.' His knowledge is that of a 'dilettante.' He has attempted too 'wide' a range, and in consequence is always 'superficial.'

No 'single writer,' be he who he may, could possibly write on 'Scripture, history and physical science,' as he has done in his Roman lectures, with more than a 'shallow versatility,' etc., etc. I heartily trust no one else will so interpret this paragraph; but I do not think it unlikely. If so, you must be prepared with your answer.

"If I go on to mention what seem to me the deficiencies of the article, it is because it may be useful to you to know the impression it made on a 'Lector revera Benevolus.'

"I wish it had more definiteness and more warmth; definiteness to satisfy and warmth to win.

"1. What I specially mean by 'definiteness' is a direct answering to the charges brought against the conductors of the *Rambler*. The Cardinal, e.g., says that 'the journal has shown an absence of all reserve and reverence in its treatment of persons and things deemed sacred.' Are 'sacred persons,' e.g., saints, one of what the article calls 'principles' of religion, or 'interests'? Again: 'It has grazed even the very edges of the most perilous abysses of error.' What answer to this is it to say that the conductors of the *Rambler* have ever felt it their duty to keep to truth of principle in matters of science and to right in the principles of government? And so on.

"People are likely to say that the article has not met the formal imputations of the Cardinal.

"2. What I mean by want of 'warmth' is this: that theologians and ascetic writers tell us that the perfection of a Christian lies in never pleading his own

excuse, except when accused of error of faith, for such error is dishonourable to God.

"Now the Cardinal has accused the *Rambler* of treachery to the cause of truth. I think it the duty of one who has occasion to notice this charge made against him to be indignant. To write this, with due respect to the accuser, of course requires skill, but it admits of being done, and has not been done.

"I fear this will leave an (unjust) impression on ill-natured readers that the writer of the article did not care much about the Cardinal's charges, and is not too much in earnest.

"These two defects will prevent the article, good as it is, from destroying suspicion. Perhaps you will say that suspicion *cannot* be destroyed."

A few days later Newman wrote to Thomas Arnold about another article in the same number.

"*Oct.* 11, 1862.

"Of course you have at least cast your eyes over the new number of the *Home and Foreign*. I am so put out with one article in it that I cannot talk of the others.

"As to *the* article, the 'Apology,' I wrote a letter to Wetherell on it, but I did not send it,* thinking he had plague enough. But this fresh article seems to me so objectionable as to make both apology itself and criticism upon it nugatory. Why *will* they go to theology?

"It is the article on Döllinger's work; and a theological discussion is lugged in, without any occasion, on the first chapter of Genesis.

* No doubt the one here printed, which was sent after all.

"Alas! why will not reviewers let that chapter alone? It is not contemporary literature: the *Review* is not a retrospective one. A grave ex-professo comment indeed, a learned, argumentative discussion upon it, this will always be worth reading; but this can hardly find place in a review. There is too much foundation work necessary, too much detail work, too much laying of bricks, of measurements, of levellings, of hewing, of joining, of plastering, in such a task to allow of its finding a place in popular literature. But let it be possible: still, the article in question does not attempt such a process. If I must describe it, I would call it a speculation edged with an insinuation, or an insinuation hoisted on a speculation.

"We are bound to interpret all Scripture by the unanimous consent of the Fathers; again, we have certain traditionary or popular ideas, true or mistaken, about the right interpretation of this chapter in particular. Is a reviewer justified in coming out with an interpretation, certainly not the popular one, nor professing to be patristical, nor claiming to be that of the author reviewed, nor appealing to any author or authors whatever, nor based on any careful body of proof, and making for itself a probable case, but consisting of a multitude of categorical assertions, hazy in their drift, and of a conclusion, not asserted, but insinuated? For myself, I am not scandalized at such 'views,' as I should call them, but *incredulus odi*. You will think my remarks, enclosed, [to Wetherell] fierce, but I have a lifelong disgust at speculations, as opposed to carefully argued theories or doctrines; but in the case of readers in general, I think the mildest criticism will

be, 'What is it all about?' with an uncomfortable suspicion as to its intended meaning.

"Of course this is but my opinion; it will be a great relief to me to find myself mistaken."

Later on again, on Mr Wetherell writing to explain matters as they seemed to him, Newman replied:

"*Nov.* 8, 1862.

"You must bear with me, if I express my feeling that, in your letter of yesterday, you take the article on the translation of Döllinger too easily. I don't care at all whether it has or has not attracted general attention, because I think it is in itself bad. Had I read it first, I never should have been so delicate about the wording, and the sending to you, of my remarks on your article on the Cardinal. It seems to me to renew the worst faults of the *Rambler*; and, as far as one article goes, justifies enemies in saying that the *Home and Foreign* is, what its original prospectus seemed to promise, nothing else than the *Rambler* under a new name.

"The article in question (1) is a *theological* article; (2) is one of those *off-hand ipse dixit theorizings* on a theological subject, which are now so common in Protestant reviews; (3) it simply goes *out of its way* to commit this grave offence; (4) it *insinuates* its conclusions when it ought either to keep silence or to speak out.

"I agree with you that an editor is not bound to any deep acquaintance with the subject of a particular article; but surely he is severely bound that its spirit, tone and effect should be good. For myself I can only

say, that if this article is to be a sample of the *Home and Foreign*, I hope the Review and I may henceforth be 'better strangers.'

"Since I made my remarks on it, which Sir John Acton received from Arnold, our Bishop's letter has appeared. I have written to Sir John upon the subject of it.

"It is a very different letter from the Cardinal's; but, little as I liked his attack upon the *Home and Foreign*, you will find, on looking at my last letter a second time, that I by no means gave an unqualified approbation to your reply to it."

In April, 1864, the directors of the *Home and Foreign Review* put an end to its existence. Strange misconceptions have existed as to the termination of what all must consider as at least one of the most brilliant literary Reviews of the last century. Most people apparently are under the impression that it was condemned by the authorities at Rome at the instance of the English ecclesiastics, and ceased in virtue of obedience to that pronouncement.* The facts are put forth clearly and calmly by Lord Acton at the close of an article in the last number, entitled "Conflicts with Rome." In this paper he stated the history of the fall of Lamennais and the then recent condemnation of Frohschammer, and then went on to discuss a Brief of Pope Pius IX issued on December 21, 1863, relative to the Munich Congress of that year. "Besides the censure of the doctrines of Frohschammer and the

* Mr Herbert Paul in his *History of Modern England*, II, 384, note, says: "Pius IX caused the *Home and Foreign Review* to be suppressed."

approbation given to the acts of the Munich Congress, the Brief," he says, "contains passages of deeper and more general import, not directly touching the action of the German divines, but having an important bearing on the position of this *Review*."

Then after pointing out that any disposition to find fault with scholastic theology was blamed by the Brief, Lord Acton continues: "Catholic writers are not bound only by those decisions of the infallible Church which regard articles of faith; they must also submit to the theological decisions of the Roman Congregations and the opinions that are commonly received in the schools. And it is wrong, though not heretical, to reject these decisions or opinions."*

"No Catholic can contemplate without alarm the evil that would be caused by a Catholic journal persistently labouring to thwart the published will of the Holy See. The conductors of the *Review* refuse to take upon themselves the responsibility of such a position. And if it were accepted, the *Review* would represent no section of Catholics." They consequently determined to print the text of the Papal Brief upon which they felt compelled to act, and to discontinue the *Review* with the number then published.

Mr Wetherell, writing to the *Pilot*, July 19, 1902, thus states the facts in regard to the cessation of the *Review:* "In December, 1863, Pius IX addressed a Brief to the Archbishop of Munich on the subject of the Munich Congress of the previous September. No part of the Brief applied distinctly to the *Home and Foreign Review;* and the letter of it could be interpreted in a

*p. 683.

sense consistent with the habitual language of the *Review*. Formally, therefore, we were not under any obligation to take note of it at all. But we considered it more respectful to the Holy See, more serviceable to the principles of the *Review*, and more accordant with the spirit in which it had been conducted to recognize openly the existence of the Brief and to interpret the words of the Pope as they were really meant. The Brief expressed with unusual emphasis the adverse opinion of Rome on certain principles for the support of which the *Review* existed. As we were not prepared to surrender these principles, it was evident that the continuance of the *Review* would result, sooner or later, in a direct conflict with Rome. Such a conflict, however it might end, must necessarily weaken the position of authority and wound the peace of the Church; and we had to consider whether our principles could derive from it any advantage sufficient to counterbalance those grave evils. Our conclusion and the grounds of it were stated by Lord Acton in an article on 'Conflicts with Rome' in the final number of the *Review*, April, 1864. He wrote the main body of the article on behalf of himself and his colleagues, and the three last paragraphs of it in his own particular character of proprietor of the *Review*."

Before leaving this subject it is due to the memory of Sir P. le Page Renouf to say a word as to the peculiar relations he had in the conduct of the *Review*. From its beginning he was one of its regular and most important contributors, and had always been consulted on matters connected with oriental and early Christian literature. He contributed articles on "The Earliest

Epochs of Authentic Chronology," "Orientalism and Early Christianity," and on "Dr Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," as well as many important reviews of books. In 1863 he became additional editor of the *Home and Foreign* with Mr Wetherell, but shortly afterwards he was appointed to be an Inspector of Schools, and the work of this Government office disabled him for editorial work, though he remained a constant contributor until the *Review* ceased in 1864.

Finally, in regard to the *Home and Foreign Review* it may be of interest to recall the verdict passed upon it by that master critic, Mathew Arnold, in his essay on "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time." Of this *Review* he says: "Perhaps in no organ of criticism in this country was there so much knowledge, so much play of mind."

Three years later, in 1867, Mr Wetherell proposed another venture, in which Acton, Simpson, Renouf and almost all the contributors of the *Home and Foreign Review*, as well as many other writers, took part. This time it took the form of a high-class weekly journal, which after considerable discussion it was agreed to call the *Chronicle*, for which the present Right Hon. Sir Roland Blennerhasset found the necessary capital. Before its appearance in the spring of 1867, the fact transpired, and the *Pall Mall Gazette* announced the forthcoming paper as a "Roman Catholic organ." This was not in any sense true, as it had been specially determined that it should be the organ of no religious party, and many of the writers had joined on that condition. The editor was Mr Wetherell, but the sub-editor, Mr Lathbury, was a member of the

Established Church, and among the writers many were non-Catholics. The circumstances which had caused the cessation of the *Home and Foreign* were obviously equally valid against the establishment of another scientific periodical claiming to represent Catholicism. The intention of the promoters and those who were acting with him was that the *Chronicle* should be a secular, not a religious, paper. A memorandum written at the time by Mr Wetherell as editor states its position clearly: "Of course, it will have a religion, but as the *Saturday Review* has; and its religion will be Catholic. The fact that it is Catholic may still strike outsiders as one of its features; but it does not so present itself to us. We are not founding a representative Catholic organ; we are not trying to propagate Catholicism, though we may have our own conviction as to the ultimate consequences of following a scientific method. We are merely pursuing, in company with a large number of Protestants, independent investigations in politics, literature, natural science, art, etc. We assume the whole Catholic dogma to be true, just as the *Saturday Review* assumes some of it to be true and some untrue. But we are not going to discuss it any more than the *Saturday Review* does. And we think we have as good a right to carry on a secular paper from our point of view as Protestants have from theirs.

"The distinctive points of the paper, as we conceive them, are these: (1) That it will have singularly good information on foreign affairs, being in immediate relations with those who are behind the scenes in politics in the most important countries of Europe. (2) That its politics will be frankly and continuously liberal; that

it will give as hearty a support as is compatible with complete independence of judgment and action to the Liberal party in Parliament; and that within the Liberal party itself it will go for the Gladstone rather than the Lowe, or Bright, or Palmerston ideas. (3) That it will have singularly good information about the state of feeling amongst the different sections of Irishmen, of which scarcely anything is really known in this country, and that it will devote great attention to Irish questions. (4) That it will be cosmopolitan in its review of the literature of the day. (5) That it will be written by men who only write on the subjects which they have specially studied; not by clever fellows who are indifferent what subject they take up, and know nothing thoroughly. (6) That it will be perfectly impartial in all its criticisms, caring more at all times for the accuracy of its facts and the soundness of its reasoning than for any 'cause' whatever."

It is only necessary to add that this ambitious programme was faithfully carried out during the brief existence of the paper. It lasted unfortunately only ten months, but in that period it produced much that deserves even now to be read for the critical principles enunciated and as a model of the scientific methods which ought to be followed in all investigations. The letters published in this volume for 1867 were written by Lord Acton to the editor, Mr Wetherell, and will afford abundant evidence of the care taken to obtain the best information possible on foreign affairs. The letters written by Lord Acton from Rome are of exceptional interest, and although much of what is contained in them was used at the time in the columns

of the *Chronicle*, a great deal has never seen the light, and even what found its way into print is now buried in a newspaper, the existence of which is now well-nigh forgotten.

The life of the brilliant *Chronicle* was brief, and on receiving the news of its impending cessation Mr Gladstone wrote to Mr Wetherell on February 5, 1868:

"I am truly concerned to receive the intelligence you send me, but I am not so much surprised as sorry. I have been indeed astonished at the amount whether of talent, of learning, or of tact exhibited in the *Chronicle*, and I am not surprised that those who have to build and lack materials of their own should supply themselves from your stores, as the Roman nobles did from the walls of the Coliseum. But a strain such as the *Chronicle* was in its political and still more in its non-political articles could hardly, I have often feared, be reached by the mass of readers. Had you allowed yourself the licence of gossip, of scandal and even of calumny which some journals employ, your merits might have been endured for the sake of your vices. But this you did not do. Your religious ground, too, while objectively broad was subjectively narrow. I mean that few in these days would thoroughly appreciate it."

In 1869 the conduct of the *North British Review* was placed in the hands of Mr Wetherell. This quarterly had been established twenty-five years previously, during the Scottish Kirk disputes, and was the secular organ of the Free Kirk party. During the 'fifties it had been a vigorous rival of the *Edinburgh* or *Quarterly*,

but had declined in the following decade. In the summer of 1869, at the suggestion of Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff, its owners and proprietors approached Mr Wetherell, who undertook, as far as possible, to gather round him once more the band of writers who had been associated with him in the *Home and Foreign* and the *Chronicle*. He had no difficulty in securing their adhesion to the new scheme. Acton and Simpson threw themselves into it with all their literary energy, and Acton scoured Europe to obtain the services of the most capable men in every country to write on the special subjects they had made their own. With the July number, which was the last under the old editorship, a prospectus was issued, written by Mr Wetherell, and designed apparently to prepare subscribers for the revolutionary completeness of the impending change and at the same time to allay the misgivings of the Kirk. In the first number which appeared under Mr Wetherell's editorship, in October, 1869, Acton contributed two articles, one on "The Massacre of St Bartholomew" and the other on "The Pope and the Council." During the brief career of this quarterly review, which finished with the January number of 1871, when Mr Wetherell's breakdown in health brought the enterprise to a close, Acton wrote two more lengthy articles, and contributed to the section entitled "Contemporary Literature," which was identical in character with the corresponding section in the *Home and Foreign* and the *Chronicle*, over a hundred carefully considered reviews of books in English, German, French and Italian.

Owing to ill-health and the pressure of starting the

Review, Mr Wetherell has been unable to keep Newman well informed about the negotiations. On the appearance of the first number he sent Newman a copy and received the following few words in return:

"*November* 7, 1869.

"Thank you for the copy of your *Review*. It is exceedingly able and careful, and the articles on 'Gladstone,' 'Saint Bartholomew' and 'Logic' are especially good. It has, to me, only one fault, but a serious one.

"I don't want a review to be religious, or even to profess Catholicity; but did not I know the quarter whence it came, I should think it written by liberal Scotchmen, religious in a way, who looked at the Church as a fiction of past time."

A year later, when he had come to know more of the *Review* and its circumstances, as a postscript to a letter on another matter Newman says: "The *North British* is wonderful in point of matter and conscientious hard work. I wish, for its influence, it had some leaven of lighter stuff."

It has been almost necessary to write at some length about the four literary undertakings in which Acton was concerned in order to appreciate the letters contained in this volume, the great part of which have to do with these enterprises. We may now briefly consider the letters themselves and note one or two points which seem to stand out prominently in them.

Most of the letters here printed relate to the conduct of the *Rambler*, of which, as already pointed out, Acton became part proprietor and joint-editor in 1858.

It is impossible to turn over these communications with Simpson without being impressed, not only with the extent of Acton's reading at the age of four-and-twenty, when most people are but beginning their studies, but even more by the care taken in his editorial capacity to obtain the best possible information on literary and political subjects, and to make the *Rambler* all that in his opinion such a magazine should be. It was not his design to make it the organ of any party, nor merely to "reproduce the ideas" of others; but his desire was to find in all countries of Europe "men who think for themselves and are not slaves to tradition and authority" (p. 1) to write with knowledge on the subjects which they have made their own.

During the whole of his connection both with the *Rambler* and with the other literary ventures that followed it, Acton showed himself to be in touch with all the foremost writers and workers both in England and in the various countries of Europe. When the notion of establishing the *Chronicle* was being mooted by Mr Wetherell, Acton threw himself into the work of preparation. He wrote, whilst on a journey to Rome and consequently out of the abundance of his knowledge, long lists of the chief continental writers who might be invited to co-operate. These are compiled with a wealth of biographical and bibliographical detail which shows in what these writers were to be considered as first-hand authorities, and why they should be induced to help in the new venture. The lists themselves prove Acton's intimate acquaintance with all that was best in the way of learning and talent in Europe. Unfortunately, for reasons of space, it has

been found impossible, at the last moment, to include in this volume these lists, which had been placed at my disposal by Mr Wetherell.

One of the objects Acton had in view in throwing himself so thoroughly into the work of the *Rambler* was to further what he called "the political education" of Catholics. In his first letter to Simpson he sketched out a series of articles by which this might be accomplished (pp. 4, 5); but, unfortunately, the entire scheme of the articles was never carried out. In order to review important works more thoroughly Acton devised a plan of "associated criticism," in which the work was to be considered by three or four readers, who then compared their impressions and conclusions before the final criticism was written by one of them. This plan was first tried by the writers in the *Rambler* in the case of Buckle's *History of Civilization*, the first volume of which was published in March, 1858. Acton's somewhat severe opinion of this work may be seen in Letters IV and V, and the results of the "association" in reviewing in two articles in the *Rambler*, the first by Simpson in July, 1858, and the second by Acton in the August number.

To many people some of the most interesting of the letters here printed will be those that deal, in one way or another, with the question of education. Letter XXVI, for example, contains much that is of interest even after this lapse of time. In it Acton expounds what "science" and scientific methods of study add to the value even of theology. He had drawn out something of this view in an article in the *Rambler* of January, 1859, as he considered it almost an "un-

known idea amongst us in England." He ends this letter by a declaration (p. 57): "I think our studies ought to be all but purposeless. They want to be pursued with chastity like mathematics. This, at least, is my profession of faith."

One feature in these letters, which will probably seem strange to those who have been accustomed to see illustrated in Acton a spirit of aggression against ecclesiastical authority, is the manifestation of his desire to avoid quarrels and to soften any expressions likely to give offence. He even wished to abstain altogether from the publication of letters and articles likely to be misunderstood by the ecclesiastical authorities, and he agreed with Newman as to the necessity of avoiding theological subjects. Writing to Simpson in August, 1859 (Letter XLII), he speaks of a "proposed letter on the composition of the Catholic body," and urges that it should be "gently done," and in several places in these letters this same spirit is clearly manifested.

Throughout this series of letters Acton ever shows himself the true scholar in his readiness to help others in their studies to the full extent of his powers. For this he would take any necessary trouble, and constant offers are made by him to lend the books that were needed for the study of some particular subject; and for this end packets of volumes are frequently spoken of as having been dispatched from Aldenham. Moreover, in reply to questions addressed to him, he was always prepared to take up his pen, to criticize, to give reasons, to suggest additions, and to amend, sometimes to a great extent, and in a way

that, allowing for his great knowledge of sources, must have cost him much time and labour. In two of the letters here printed—Letters XLV and LVII—he suggests to Simpson the need of having lighter articles, and, asking him to write them, proposes not merely the titles—"A Plea for Bores" and "The Philosopher's Stone"—but sketches an idea of the treatment and furnishes some considerable number of illustrations. These ideas were worked up by Simpson into the form in which they appear in the pages of the magazine.

Besides the literary side of the *Rambler*, *Home and Foreign*, etc., in which Acton was perhaps chiefly interested, he took no less care that the best information might be obtained for the political department. Whilst abroad, he devoted much of his time to studying the trend of European politics, and the letters he sent back to England are full of first-hand information. Although much of this was utilized at the time in the magazines and reviews, it is interesting to read once more the impressions made upon so acute an observer of the events which were happening in Austria, Germany and Italy fifty years ago, and to see how he obtained his information. In this regard, his views about "Austria and Prussia" and the then possible "confederation of German States" (pp. 93-103) may be read with advantage by all who desire to understand the history of those countries. The two letters represent the opinions current at the time. The "Roman Question," raised in 1860, is treated of in several of the letters, not only because of the urgency of the case at the time, but in regard to the works of

Döllinger and Dr Manning, which both appeared at this period, and which were reviewed in the pages of the *Rambler*. Acton's "proposed solution of the Roman question" (pp. 154-5) took for granted that it was practically certain that the Pope would have to leave Rome for good, and that, being obliged to seek a refuge in some other country, he might probably find a fitting position in Bavaria (p. 153). In this, as in many of the forecasts of the possible issue of events made at the time, Acton was, of course, wrong; but this does not diminish the interest which the representation of the events possesses for the student of contemporary history.

At the end of this volume, a few letters not belonging to the periods of Acton's literary undertakings are printed, as they possess much intrinsic interest. It has generally been supposed that both Simpson and Acton were in some way concerned with Mr Gladstone's attack on the Vatican Decrees in 1874. The writer of Simpson's biographical notice in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, for example, says: "When Mr Gladstone was writing his treatise on 'Vaticanism,' Simpson was constantly at his side, and the curious learning of that famous pamphlet is thus largely accounted for." The letter from Acton to Simpson, dated November 4, 1874, here printed, proves that Acton at least, and almost certainly Simpson, had no notion that Gladstone had any such pamphlet in preparation. So far from helping in this, Acton declares that he did everything in his power to prevent the publication, but found Gladstone deaf "to all political, spiritual and other obvious arguments against it."

Amongst these letters will also be found several dealing with Acton's own attitude towards the Vatican Decrees and the Council generally. It would seem from them that whatever position he had taken in regard to the question of Papal Infallibility before the promulgation of the dogma, after the decision he accepted the Council and its decrees as he did those of every other Council. The reply made to Archbishop Manning by Acton, which was drafted for him by Simpson, seems to answer for both of them.

It remains only to record my thanks to those who have enabled me to publish these papers. In the first place I am indebted to my old friend, Mr William Simpson, for having placed his uncle's papers at my disposition, and to Lord Acton, for having consented so readily to the publication of his father's letters. Then I am greatly indebted to Mr Wetherell not only for letting me have the Acton letters in his possession, and the Newman letters addressed to him, to choose from, but for reading and criticizing my Introduction, and giving me information about the literary enterprises with which he was so closely concerned. To Miss F. M. Capes I owe permission to print the letters addressed to her father, which are to be found in this Introduction; and, lastly, I am much indebted to the Superior and Fathers of the Birmingham Oratory for leave to print all the Newman letters which are here published for the first time.

LETTERS OF JOHN D'ALBERG ACTON 1ST BARON

1858

Letter I

Lord Acton becomes associated with Mr Richard Simpson in the management of the *Rambler*—His desire that it should not be the organ of any one party or school of thought—The activity of Catholic theologians in Germany—Need of educating English Catholics as to the true notion of a Christian State—Proposed series of articles by which this may be done—His desire to review works carefully

February 16, 1858.

I will, please God, admit into the political department [of the *Rambler*] no writings of men who are the devoted followers of any single school, least of all the followers of a writer so dazzling, but so little to be trusted and less to be imitated, as Count de Maistre, for whom indeed I have the deepest respect; but it is no good reproducing ideas, and I will try to find men who think for themselves and are not slaves to tradition and authority. This leads me to speak of the new shareholder. I presume you will not allow direct influence to anybody but Meynell* and ourselves, now that Ward† is not a fourth. Unanimity and

* The Rev. Charles Meynell, D.D., born in 1843; educated at Sedgley Park, Oscott and Rome; professor of Philosophy at Oscott 1856-7; died at Caverswall, Staffordshire, May 3, 1882.

† William George Ward, the distinguished Oxford convert; born March 21, 1812; died July 6, 1882.

compactness will add to the effect and influence of our writings more than anything else, and I think that we three would get on famously together. An increase of numbers would, I fear, introduce a considerable risk of disagreement or at least a certain indefiniteness and vagueness of opinion which would be ruinous. As to Ward's refusal, provided he continues to wish us well, I regret it only because I fear it will prevent the increase in the size of the *Rambler* which you proposed. I strongly doubt whether the scholastic formal theology of Ward and others, *pace* Dr Todd,* is what is wanted in our time. In the only country where there is great intellectual activity joined to great learning, in Germany, Catholic theology has taken a different line and with wonderful fruit. The adversaries of religion in England are the disciples of its adversaries in Germany, and I conceive that Catholic divines here cannot do better than follow the example of those who have so successfully combated every form of error in the country where the van is of the great fight. I am not disposed to accept the paradox about the necessity of ignorance in England, and I think any man so much inclined to despair and give up the contest is better out of the *Rambler*. But he [Ward] is a good fellow, and might still be made to render good service.

You see that I speak with the confidence and openness of an old friend. The confidence you have placed in me makes it incumbent upon me to tell you my

* Rev. William Gowan Todd was born in 1829, took his degree of doctor in theology in Rome, and was the author of several books. In the later years of his life he founded and managed St Mary's Orphanage, Blackheath, where he died on July 24, 1877.

thoughts about the *Rambler*, and the manner in which I purpose to carry out what you have entrusted to me. I have thought and read a good deal upon political subjects, and have read a great lot of the famous writers, to try to find out a clear view which I could rely on in public life. I will endeavour to turn these studies to account and to pursue them farther in the service of our common undertaking. (1) Now the first point about it is that I am very far from agreeing with any of the more famous Catholic writers, or with any of the political parties in England. But I think that there is a philosophy of politics to be derived from Catholicism on the one hand and from the principles of our constitution on the other—a system as remote from the absolutism of one set of Catholics as from the doctrinaire constitutionalism of another [the *Correspondant*,* etc.] I conceive it possible to appeal at once to the example and interest of the Church and to the true notion of the English constitution. I am not on this account an admirer either of all Catholic governments or of all constitutional governments, but I think that the true notion of a Christian State, and the true latent notion of the constitution coincide and complete each other. In this way it is possible to obtain a singular repose and confidence in judging

* The *Correspondant* was founded in France in 1829, as a bi-weekly journal. The words of Canning, "Civil and religious liberty for the whole world," were adopted as the motto. After many vicissitudes as a journal, it was enlarged and adopted as Montalembert's organ in 1853. His influence gathered round him some of the most celebrated writers of the time, including such men as Mgr Dupanloup, MM. Foisset, Albert de Broglie, de Falloux, etc. Montalembert's programme was to advocate the union of Catholicism with liberty rightly understood.

political events and men both at home and abroad. And in this way the Catholic elements of the constitution may be restored to their proper importance, and the Catholic body may legitimately recover their proper influence in the State. I have no time here, but this is the brief sketch of a theory I should like to carry out, establish and apply in a series of articles. I think that we are no longer bound to conduct ourselves with a view to momentary expediency, and that we need no longer humiliate ourselves and eat dirt to obtain the support of the Liberal or Radical party. We have got about as much as we shall get from them, and it would be well to see whether this alliance is a safe one. Those Catholics who prefer independence generally stick up for one or two things, and go into factious opposition when they do not obtain them. I would have a complete body of principles for the conduct of English Catholics in political affairs, and if I live and do well, I will gradually unfold them. The Catholics want political education. I would try to get up a few such essays as the following: Edmund Burke as a teacher for Catholics. In the writings of his last years (1792-1797) whatever was Protestant or partial or revolutionary of 1688 in his political views disappeared, and what remained was a purely Catholic view of political principles and of history. I have much to say about this that nobody has ever said. The best being all in some fragments of speeches and letters; but in a general way you will find what I mean, so far as profane politics are concerned, in the appeal from the new to the old Whigs. (2) Whom do we thank for emancipation? Neither the Irish Catholics nor the

Whigs. I have much to say about this, to set us right with respect to an important moment of our history. (3) Contrast of foreign constitutions with our own, showing that there is properly no connexion and no reason why we should like or admire them (as Englishmen). I have picked up much on my travels that throws light on this important matter. (4) Liberalism and liberality—how the two don't go together. (5) Political influence of the Church with a good deal of historical illustration, and a result which will satisfy no *party*, and will astonish our old-fashioned friends, Catholics as well as Protestants. (6) Protestantism as a political principle. These two articles ought to be in successive numbers. A famous German statesman has written an eloquent pamphlet on the Protestant side of this question, which has not been demolished. (7) Career of O'Connell—not till I feel a little more confidence in myself. (8) Catholic Patriotism. (9) Civilization : what ? (10) A series of notices of the great Catholic political writers of the continent ; judgement of them and a few striking extracts (Maistre, Schlegel, Haller, Müller, Bonald, Görres, Montalembert). I might, if it was wished, extend these notices to the greater Protestant writers since the Revolution. (11) Then I have a great deal to say about Austria ; her character as a State and her position towards the Church. (12) If I have time I should like to give a view of parties and shades of opinions from reviews and other organs, both in England and abroad. I have so many friends in almost all countries that I will try to put myself into correspondence with some who will give me good materials for articles on foreign politics,

a subject I ought to treat carefully and elaborately from having been so much abroad.

I should like to prepare several of these subjects for the first number after midsummer, in order that my doctrines may at once be clear both to the public and to the other contributors. I hope I can safely promise you that I will never write of unworthy conciliation or of virulent controversy. I should like, especially at first, until my line and tendency is better known, to avoid disputes. My ideas, however, are so little popular just now that disputes will arise soon enough, and it will be important to conduct them with forbearance and dignity.

The list I have given is to be considered of course only a vague indication of the character of my designs and wishes. I told you that my studies have been chiefly in history, and this is of great use to me in political matters, but I have materials ready on so many points of foreign, partly mediaeval history, that if I can make them interesting I would sometimes send you a contribution to your own department. This will depend on whether you think such things can be made interesting to the *Rambler* public. I will also do my part of the short notices and reviews, particularly of German literature, and as there are not many up to it, I would here go beyond my proper limits, if you like. All this depends on your experience of what is conducive to the advantage of the review.

I hope you will send me a word at once to say whether in a general way such a line as I have hinted at would do. I shall go and sit again for a few weeks at the feet of Döllinger, and will write nothing that

I am not sure he would approve, or that I should not be able to stand by if I come into public life. I greatly doubt whether you would do well to publish our names. This can soon be given to understand, and there would be no secret about it. You might have all the advantages you wish in this way, and I suspect it would be better, but I do not say this because I dislike my own name appearing, with which, on the contrary, you may do what you like.

Do you think it very necessary to give the review a strong theological character, beyond Meynell's philosophy and our common custom of taking the religious view of questions? If so, would it not be well to get a neat historical essay from Dalgairns,* and perhaps a review of biblical learning from Father St John† at Birmingham? I hope Capes will sometimes write for my questions, and that he will not care if I am not so strong against Napoleon as he is. A subject I forgot to mention above is this: I find a singular resemblance on many points between Russia and the United States, and could make something of an article showing the analogy between them and their equal incompatibility with good government and the true principles both of liberty and authority.

* Rev. John Dobree Dalgairns, M.A., born October 21, 1818; received into the Church at the same time as Newman in 1845; became an Oratorian and was for some years at Edgbaston. He succeeded Fr Faber as Superior of the Brompton Oratory, and died April 7, 1876; author of *The Holy Communion, its Philosophy, Theology and Practice* (1861), *The Devotion to the Sacred Heart* (1853), and other important works and prefaces to the works of others.

† Rev. Ambrose St John, born June 29, 1815; educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford; received into the Church in 1845; became an Oratorian, and was for ten years headmaster of the school at Edgbaston; died May 24, 1875.

I have allowed my letter to grow beyond all reasonable compass without having said half the things there were to say. At least I hope you will understand the temper in which I am anxious to conduct the political department of the *Rambler*. I am glad that I have plenty of time before me to get up the subjects I don't understand at all and to go deeper into those I have studied.

Letter II

Lord Acton expresses his disbelief in councils of management for the *Rambler*—Does not find himself in harmony of thought with "converts"—Manning and Hope are the only ones he is likely to agree with—Need of saying new and startling things if English Catholics are to be politically educated—Foreign politics should be done well—This department neglected by English journals

Aldenham Park, Sunday [*February* 28, 1858].

As to the proposed council or councils, it seems to me that it is a harmless but then not a very useful plan. . . I never converse with any even of the best and cleverest converts, Dalgairns, Morris,* MacMullen,†

* John Brande Morris, born in 1812; graduated at Balliol College, Oxford, in 1834. For some years he was assistant to Dr Pusey in the Hebrew Professorship and was lecturer in Syriac. He was received into the Church in 1846, was ordained priest at Oscott in 1848 and died at Hammersmith in 1880.

† Canon MacMullen, born in 1814; died Oct. 28, 1895. In early life he secured a scholarship at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and as an Anglican ministered to the poor at Leeds. When received into the Catholic Church he repaired to Rome and was there admitted to the priesthood; in 1853 appointed to assist at St Mary's, Moorfields, and three years later Rector of the Catholic Church, Chelsea, where he remained until failing eyesight compelled him to resign his cure in 1880.

Oakeley,* Allies,† Marshall,‡ Wilberforce,§ etc., etc., etc., without finding them stating what I hold to be most false. It is just the mistakes of these, our best men, that it will be best worth while to discuss. I cannot look for sympathy with my ideas in any considerable number of men. Hope‖ and Manning are the only ones that I feel likely on most occasions to agree with. There is so much that is utterly new and unexpected even to our wisest friends to be said, argued and illustrated in the process of politically educating the Catholic body in England, that any increase of numbers at first is sure to dilute our sayings and diminish our strength. I hold this to be the case too in other than political questions. As to anybody acquainted with German learning and modes of thought the philosophy and theology borrowed from France do not inspire much respect. But these are not my line, so I will say

* Rev. Frederick Oakeley, born 1802; M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford; prebendary of Lichfield 1830; received into the Catholic Church 1845; canon of the diocese of Westminster 1852; died 1880.

† Thomas W. Allies died June 17, 1903, aged 90; was one of the early Oxford converts. In 1829 he won the Newcastle scholarship at Eton, and subsequently became examining chaplain to Bishop Bloomfield and rector of Launton near Bicester; was received into the Church in 1850; was author of many valuable historical works on the history of the Church. For many years he held the post of secretary to the Catholic Poor School Committee.

‡ Probably Thomas William Marshall, LL.D., born in 1818; received into the Catholic Church in 1845; first inspector of Catholic Schools in 1853; author of *The History of Christian Missions*, etc.; died Dec. 14, 1877.

§ Henry William Wilberforce, born 1807; B.A. Oriel College, Oxford, 1830; M.A. 1833; Vicar of East Farleigh from 1843 to 1850, when he was received into the Catholic Church; was proprietor and editor of *The Catholic Standard*, better known by its later title of *The Weekly Register*, 1854-63; died 1863.

‖ James Robert Hope-Scott, born 1812; fellow of Merton 1833; D.C.L. 1843; was received into the Church with Manning in 1851; assumed the name of Scott in 1853 on his marriage with the possessor of Abbotsford; died 1873.

no more about them. Your plan of two councils seems almost superfluous, inasmuch as Stokes* and any other friends and wellwishers can be consulted privately as much as is needed; and the more prominence we give to the council system, the more it will expect to influence us, and it will be an instrument in the hands of Burns or anybody for the purpose of controlling the editors. Let us have such a council founded on nothing but the good wishes of its members towards the *Rambler*, and on our invitation, numerous enough nominally to include both councils as you propose them, and then the absent ones could appear whenever they had an opportunity, being in London for Poor Schools or otherwise. If you at once established yourself as the controller of the council and take the initiative in all discussions, no harm can be done. I do not see why Stokes as well as Manning, indeed everybody who is distinguished for position and talent and at the same time a friend of the *Rambler*, should not be nominally on the council.

I think we might make considerable use of correspondence to get at all variety of views and opinions. I would even recommend that we should offer to insert refutations and remonstrances, at least in the shape of

* S. Nasmyth Stokes died in the seventy-first year of his age, August 1, 1891; was a distinguished scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. After his reception into the Catholic Church from a very early date he was connected with the Catholic Poor School Committee, and became in time chief Catholic Inspector of Schools. In this capacity he was largely instrumental in the establishment of the great Liverpool Training College for Elementary Teachers. He had a very ready pen, which was always at the service of the Catholic cause in education. In early life at Cambridge he, with Mr Beresford-Hope and Mr F. A. Paley, was the founder of the "Cambridge Camden Society."

letters, or even as articles. It is better that such discussions should be carried on on our own ground than that they should make themselves an organ elsewhere for the purpose of blackguarding us. It has occurred to me that I might receive payment for my contributions on the understanding that I would use the money for the purpose of obtaining contributions from abroad (from some distinguished political writers whom I have in my eye), which might be worked up into articles on Austria, Italy, France, Russia, etc., a department I should like to do well.

1. No English journal does foreign questions well.

2. No English journal keeps a judicial position aloof from all parties.

3. No English journal, in my opinion, represents the true constitutional doctrine.

4. And none, I think, maintains the true Catholic view of public affairs.

Cannot we try to occupy some of these vacancies?

Letter III

Review of Buckle's *History of Civilization* to be prepared—Proposed joint examination of the book and comparison of ideas for reviewing important works—Newman and the *Rambler*

Aldenham, Friday [*March* 26].

Allies is writing a review of Buckle for the *Atlantis*,* that's why we can get nothing out of him.

* The *Atlantis*, "a register of literature and science," was started by Cardinal Newman as the organ of the Catholic University of Ireland, and was supposed to be "conducted by members" of that university. It began

It will appear on the first of July. Would it not be a good plan to have one in the *Rambler* on the same day? I think we might get up a better one than Allies's, especially if we try the dodge we were proposing the other night at the Cardinal's. If three or four people read the book—you and I and Doyle and anybody else you can think of—we might exchange our observations and queries at once, and then each one should put down his remarks and discoveries and send them to whoever writes the article. This seems a capital opportunity for trying the association plan in the *Rambler*. How say you, and cannot five rather than four persons be made to join in it? I have had a long and very satisfactory talk with Newman on matters connected with the *Rambler*. He hopes before long to make the *Atlantis* a quarterly. Will not that diminish our chance of being able to set up as a quarterly?

Letter IV

Wiseman's *Four Last Popes*—*Rambler* article a special gratification to the Cardinal—Buckle's *History* superficial and can be easily criticized

Aldenham, Tuesday [*March* 30, 1858].

In spite of Capes's good-natured criticism my paper is utterly worthless, as everything I write without rewriting it two or three times, and this I had no time for. What he says about the Cardinal and

in 1858 and lasted till 1870, although it was suspended during the years 1864, 1865.

Baines* is quite new to me, and very important, as it will render your article† a cause of special gratification to H. E. I am a little afraid of foolish correspondents of the *Register* writing about "transparent irony." Any foolish attack of that kind would, however, give an opportunity for a very indignant and triumphant reply.

I got through Buckle‡ last night. Setting aside the theory, the learning of the book is utterly superficial and obsolete. He is altogether a mere humbug and a very bad arguer. He has taken great pains to say things that have been said much better before in books he has not read. He has no knowledge of the classics and still less of theological literature. We can expose him completely. I find I was mistaken as to the importance he gives to physical phenomena. I am afraid Allies looks at the book with awe, and will treat it with respect. Had we better bring out our review before his or at the same time with it?

I am revising the proofs of a new book§ of Morris! Eheu!

* Peter Augustine Baines, O.S.B., Bishop of Siga, and Vicar Apostolic of the Western district: born 1787; died 1843. Was connected with Prior Park, the foundation of which involved him in great financial difficulties. Cardinal Wiseman had said in his book that he "was destined in the mind of Leo XII to be the first English cardinal."

† This article on Cardinal Wiseman's *Recollections of the Four Last Popes*, which was published at this time, appeared in the April number of the *Rambler* under the title "Sunny Memories of Rome."

‡ The *History of Civilization*, the first volume of which was published at this time.

§ This was no doubt *Talectha Koomee: or, The Gospel Prophecy of Our Lady's Assumption;* a drama in four acts. London, 1858. 8vo, in verse.

Letter V

Meeting of writers at Aldenham—Buckle can be "thoroughly shown up"—Dalgairns' pamphlet on *Mystics*

Aldenham, Easter [*Sunday, April* 4, 1858].

I shall expect you on Tuesday. As you pass that way, I hope you will bring Capes with you. I do not write to propose it to him, because you say you may see him at Worcester, so I fear a letter to Woodchester would not reach him in time. Therefore pray invite and induce him to come, and explain why I do not write to him and entrust the matter to your keeping. But don't let him waste time packing his bag, but bring him on Tuesday. Your rooms are ready, and Formby shall this night air them. We can have a very satisfactory and private talk on all possible matters, especially as Badeley* is not coming.

My disgust in reading Buckle was balanced by the conviction that he can be thoroughly shown up, and convicted of having uttered nothing that is either new or true. You need only read the first part of the volume —but we can discuss it at leisure in a few days. Dalgairns has sent me his *Mystics* † in the shape of a pamphlet, which brings them under our cognizance, and

* Edward Badeley, Q.C., F.S.A., a distinguished ecclesiastical counsel; became a Catholic in 1852; died 1868. Cardinal Newman dedicates his volume of poems to him, and refers to him in the *Apologia*. Badeley was one of Newman's counsel in the Achilli case.

† *The German Mystics of the Fourteenth Century*. London: 1858. 8vo. Reprinted from the *Dublin Review*.

I am much tempted to notice one or two blunders he has fallen into.

Letter VI

Desires a series of critical articles like Simpson's on Buckle—Suggests subjects for these: Lamennais, Lacordaire, Gioberti, Vico, etc.—Has his articles on Buckle and Guizot ready

Aldenham [*End of May*, 1858].

If I was you, I would undertake this [style of paper] as a regular series and refer at the beginning of the next paper of the kind to that on Buckle as the beginning of these analyses. Who will do among Catholics the same thing? There have been in our time varieties enough of opinion and doctrine amongst us, represented by able men, and pointing out many dangers to which we are exposed and which we don't always escape. There would be Lamennais, a very suggestive and prophetic figure, admirably done by the infidel Renan in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of last September. Then the theory of the old French Catholics before the schism of 1848, best represented by Lacordaire, whom it is pleasant to read. After which the two new schools and the remains of Gallican and Jansenist ideas still to be found. In Italy Gioberti,* whose posthumous works are the best Italian writings since Vico,† but so full of wickedness

* Vincenzo Gioberti, an Italian writer; born at Turin in 1801; died at Paris, 1852; ordained priest in 1825; taught philosophy in the public school at Brussels; his works upheld the teaching of St Thomas Aquinas against Kant and Cousin. In 1848 he was recalled to Italy by national acclamation, and became Prime Minister of Sardinia. He soon despaired for Italy, and returned to Paris.

† Giovanni Battista Vico, an Italian philosopher, born at Naples in 1688; died 1744. The great work of Vico is the *Principi di una Scienza*

that I dare not write a notice of them; but his earlier character was well sketched by Brownson * and Rosmini, whom Bunbury knows well; finally the *Civiltà Cattolica*, that is to say Taparelli, a clever, narrow, half-educated fellow, who has collected all his best things in four volumes. Besides which Balmes† is a curious appearance, and Brownson still more curious and a very remarkable sign of the times, worthy of dissection—a good subject. Add to which our dear friend Ventura,‡ of whose compliments to me I was ignorant;—etc., etc. All this would lead us to the cave of Æolus, and explain whence the winds come that blow at Brompton and York Place, in Maynooth and at Birmingham, etc., etc.

Do not regret the non-appearance of your paper on the Catholics.§ It will give an éclat of a certain kind

Nuova. He is said to have "studied Plato most of all," and to have striven "to form his style upon that of Cicero and [to] have loved the sad wisdom of Dante."

* Orestes Augustus Brownson, born 1803; a distinguished speaker and philosophical writer; became a Catholic in 1854; conducted for many years the *Brownson Quarterly Review;* he was offered a chair in the Catholic University of Dublin, but preferred to remain in America; died April 17, 1876.

† James Lucian Balmez, born in Catalonia in Spain, 1810; died 1848; a theological and philosophical writer. His most important work is *Protestantism and Catholicism compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe.*

‡ G. Joachim Ventura de Raulica, a celebrated orator and religious writer; born at Palermo in 1792; died at Versailles, August 2, 1861. In 1824 he became General of the Theatines; was in Rome during the difficult times which preceded and followed the accession of Pope Pius IX; held strong views as to the conciliation of religion and liberalism, and had to seek a refuge in Paris in 1849; was the author of many works, the most celebrated of which was perhaps the *De Modo Philosophandi* (1828), which was severely criticized by Lamennais in *L'Avenir.*

§ "The Influence of Catholics in England," which appeared later in the *Rambler*, July, 1858.

to the July number besides that on Buckle.* My disagreement with Capes's politics, who wrote to ask me whether he might write the article, is of no consequence, and we will not say a word about it. I'll write a paper on the same subject next winter. I have Buckle and Guizot ready for August. Do write several short notices of at least half a page each. I shall have some too on several new books. The little compliment to Montalembert in the notice of Villemain † was necessary after the indirect remarks in that on Félix. ‡ This week I suppose we shall have Allies on Buckle in the *Atlantis*. I hope you come home richly laden with Lutetian spoil. I am afraid my dicta on Philip cannot claim to be very magistral. Who wrote on Laforet in June?

Letter VII

A journey to Paris—Will look out passages for Simpson—Joint article on Buckle by five people is said to be preparing for the *Quarterly*—French translation of Döllinger is very bad—Criticizes Simpson's paper on Brownson—Gladstone's book on *Homer* has appeared—Meynell of Oscott has had a difficulty with his bishop about writing for the *Rambler*—Advises Simpson to read Origen against Celsus

Aldenham, Thursday [*? June*].

I sought you in vain last Saturday all over Paris from the Rue des Postes to the Hotel Bedford.

* Simpson's article on the *History of Civilization* called "Mr Buckle's Thesis and Method" appeared in the same number pp. 27-42.

† This was in a notice of *La Tribune Moderne*, by M. Villemain, which Acton contributed to the number of the *Rambler* for August, 1858, pp. 40-42.

‡ *Le Progrès par le Christianisme: Conférences de Notre Dame de Paris*, par le R. P. Félix, noticed by Acton in the July *Rambler*, pp. 70-72.

I came on to England on Saturday night, and have already possessed myself of your papers and seen Burns, Allies and Meynell. I will get the passages ready which you want for Buckle. Where are they and your MS. to go? and when are you coming back to England? Pray let me know exactly what you want me to do for July. I shall have a notice on Russell's *Mezzofanti* * ready and on some other books. Do you want a second article on Buckle or one longish article? I will if you like do my best to demolish his learned reputation without reference to religion or philosophy. Five people are working at an article upon him for the July *Quarterly*, and he is waiting for this to appear before he answers all his critics, as I am told, contemptuously. Be sure and take notes at Paris of new French books fit for our notices. I have seen some sheets of the French translation of Döllinger, which is very bad, but it will hardly be out in time for a July notice. Your excellent paper on Brownson † seemed to me incomplete as a critique of him from the omission of his last chapter, "Conclusion," in which, as he does not speak of himself but of all other things, he seems to me to appear in a much more characteristic light than anywhere else. I too hear that Todd is cross, but I am comforted when I think of his very dismal article,‡ in which he selects two questions as samples of Catholic politics, about which I am sorry to say I disagree with him completely. July I understand will have a paper

* This notice on *The Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti* by C. W. Russell, D.D., of Maynooth, appeared in the July number of the Magazine, pp. 61-63.

† Named "Dr Brownson's Experiences" in the May *Rambler*, pp. 337-346.

‡ "The Mission of the Laity" in the May *Rambler*.

from each of the Capeses,* you on Buckle, your other paper† and, I suppose, one on the times of persecution. I conclude therefore that I may confine myself to short notices‡ and that if you and Capes do a few we shall have enough to make that department almost a new feature.

I am anxious to find time for a paper I have promised to the January *Atlantis*, and if I do not write it now I expect I shall be too busy with the *Rambler* later in the year. Gladstone's book§ tempts me sorely to review it, but I am afraid it is hardly a suitable subject for our public. Meynell, I suppose, has told you of his difficulty with his bishop about the *Rambler*. The same thing might recur, and it might be prudent for us to be independent of the regard which Meynell is obliged to have for his ecclesiastical position. Neither he nor Ullathorne, I find, understood the drift of the observations on Baines, so I suppose they were much less generally seen through than we supposed. I think you should follow up the dispute in the *W[eekly] R[egister]* about your Westbury story. It seemed a happy diversion and made you appear a martyr to the zeal with which you stuck up for the dicta of the Car-

* J. M. Capes and his brother Frederick. The former, John More Capes, the founder of the *Rambler*, was born 1812; died 1889; became a Catholic in 1845 when incumbent of St John's, Bridgewater. His connexion with the *Rambler* is spoken of in the Introduction. The latter, Frederick Capes, was born Jan. 1, 1816, and died August 1, 1888; educated at King's College, London, and practised for some years as a Proctor at Doctor's Commons; became a Catholic in 1846, and was for many years a neighbour and very intimate friend of Simpson's.

† "Influence of Catholics."

‡ Acton contributed ten pages of short notices to this number.

§ i.e. *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*, which was published this year. A short notice appeared in the June *Rambler*, p. 423.

dinal... Do not let any one review Guizot's *Memoirs;* I will get it done capitally in a month or two. I will write as soon as I have read your MS., but I found a new volume of Origen here, and sat up last night reading him against Celsus. If you have not read it, it is delightful.

Letter VIII

Simpson's article on Buckle is excellent—Urges him to write a series upon English philosophic systems—Carlyle the "most original and striking figure in our literary world"—Many of the Simancas papers about Mary Stuart in Paris library—Amherst, just made bishop, is as good a friend to the *Rambler* as MacMullen

[*Aldenham, Sunday, June* 6, 1858].

I received this morning your extract and notice about Queen Elizabeth,* and at the same time a very short political article from Capes,† who promises also a short review. We are threatened with a theological paper from Maguire,‡ and shall greatly need some levity from Capes junior.§ Your paper on Buckle is excellent, and I should do harm by preparing nonsense of my own. Nothing has been written upon his book nearly so good as your paper. I wish

* A short paper called "Queen Elizabeth in Love," which appeared in the July *Rambler*.

† The article was entitled "The Deadlock in Politics," and appeared in the *Rambler* for July 1858, pp. 1-11.

‡ John Maguire, D.D., born in the last decade of the eighteenth century; died Oct. 7, 1865; had a great reputation as a theologian; was Vice-President of Old Hall, 1836-8, and became Canon Theologian of the Westminster Chapter.

§ J. M. Capes, however, contributed a second article called "Hogg on Shelley."

you would follow up this style of writing. There are half a dozen systems prevailing in the country, one worse than the other, and if each of them received such elucidatory treatment as you have bestowed upon this Positivist, the result would be a complete diagnosis of the state of English intellect. The utilitarian school has much sympathy with the regular Positivists, though distinct from them, and both Macaulay's and Father Roger's refutation are forgotten and unsatisfactory. J. S. Mill would afford a capital representative of this class. Then there would be the "Apostles of the Flesh," "the muscular Christians," more popular in their action, but with a kind of speculative foundation—Kingsley, Maurice, etc. And if you divest yourself of some of your sympathy for Carlyle, you might handle well that most original and striking figure in our literary world. If you would pursue this idea, to which I am led by your most felicitous demolition of Buckle, it would make our own course clear, and would do us no little service. If Proudhon's book* is illogical, I marvel, for that is not his defect, and though I doubt not it is blasphemous and detestable, yet he is by no means intellectually despicable. Many of the Simancas papers are in Paris, where Mignet used them. Lenormant, of the *Correspondant*, can tell you all about them; he is to be found at the Imperial Library. But Mignet discovered with all his opportunities so little that is new about Mary Stuart that I dare say they are defective for that period.

* Pierre Joseph Proudhon. It is difficult to say what special book of this prolific writer is meant: possibly *La Justice poursuite par l'Eglise*, which appeared this year.

Capes's politics, I suppose, will begin the July number. Then Buckle; a notice of a foolish old French bishop in Latin* is to fill the last page, Capes insisting. For my part, if the devil drives, I must needs do what you wish by way of introducing your Buckle—at least it depends a little on inspiration. I will take care to say a few startling things in the short notices. Can't you send one or two, written by way of relaxation during the heat? As to the editorship, I beg to refer you to a very good saying of Pope Zachary to Pepin the Short, which, if you seek, you shall find in Baronius. I find I was mistaken in supposing Burns had bought Capes's shares. As he is not a proprietor, he need not be attended to. Meynell has submitted to me his letter to his bishop representing the coming *Rambler* as a miracle of prudence and decency. If he answers civilly, it will be good for us altogether. Amherst's mitre† is almost as good as if MacMullen had had it, for I had written to him just before about the *Rambler*, and he said that only his dullness of pen prevented him from helping us.

If I do my part of Buckle for August, with a few short notices, it will be all I can do till November, for I shall be much distracted for a couple of months in the summer. I am almost afraid of John Arundell,‡ but I will write to him for a contribution. Have you not made Veuillot's§ acquaintance? You pass by his door

* Caulet, Bishop of Pamiers; *Rambler*, July, 1858, p. 72.

† Francis K. Amherst was consecrated Bishop of Northampton July 4, 1858, a few weeks after this letter.

‡ Now Lord Arundell of Wardour.

§ Louis Veuillot, a French author and journalist, was born in 1813. He was first secretary to Marshall Bugeaud, and afterwards to the statesman Guizot. In 1848 he became editor of the Paris journal, *L'Univers*, in which

daily—44, Rue du Bac—and Bonnetty is to be found hard by—10, Rue de Babylon. You will have your revenge upon me in the July number for the firebrand imprudence of my short notices.

Letter IX

The July *Rambler*—Inquiries about the works of Donoso Cortès—Theology not a stationary science—New materials exist for the life of St Charles Borromeo—Mr Healy Thompson's life of the saint not up to the mark

Aldenham [*June* 11, 1858].

Capes, in consequence of a letter from you, wrote yesterday to propose to make up the July number and edit it in your absence. To whom I, touched with an untimely desire to go to Paris for a week, forwarded incontinent what MSS. I had. I conceive that politics had a traditional claim to open the number, and sent Capes's paper,* not a good one by any means, first; moreover, I had no introduction ready to the Buckle, which Capes will prefix briefly. But the matter of Quetelet,† and the termination introductory to Buckle No. 2, I did subjoin. It will, I assure you, be a capital number, inasmuch as I have written nothing but a few notices which Capes will probably see cause to omit.

he had many controversies with Dupanloup, Gratry, etc. His uncompromising attitude in favour of the Church and against Napoleon III led to the suppression of the journal from 1860 to 1867.

* J. M. Capes's paper was called "The Deadlock in Politics," and is printed as the first article in the *Rambler*, July, 1858.

† A short passage on the value of M. Quetelet's authority, as quoted by Buckle, contributed to Simpson's article on "Mr Buckle's Thesis and Method," *Rambler*, July 1858, pp. 36, 37.

I should have spoiled your Buckle by any introduction of my own, and was extremely unwilling to write it, and I almost think it would be wasting good theory to use it merely as a set-off against him, who is without that very sufficiently shown up. I am glad your article comes out at the same time as those in the *Atlantis* and *Quarterly*. I am delighted that you accept the idea of pursuing the critique of our chief unchristian philosophers and that you add Proudhon to them. Have you read Donoso Cortès's* reply to his former work? If you see Veuillot, I wish you would refresh his memory about an edition of Donoso's writings, which he was preparing. If you want to gratify him very much, you might ask whether he is going on with the publication of his own collected essays. I find a very good paper against the Benthamites in the works of a very accomplished American, Legaré,† which I dare say you will be glad to see when you tackle Mill junior. Meynell thirsts for the demolition of Kant, which he proposes to himself—which is akin to the wish that Judas may be hanged. He has made all things straight with his bishop, and piously hopes that we shall not get him into a scrape.

There is a good new book on St Thomas by Jourdain,‡ which I have been recommending to him. He is a very clever fellow. I wish he was not so mad and knew more. Maguire, wrote Capes, was to have done

* Juan F. M. M. Donoso Cortès, Marquis de Valdegamas. *Dépêches et corr. polit.*, 1848-53; a fervent Catholic, after having been a freethinker; came to Paris as Ambassador for Spain in 1851; became the firm friend of Montalembert, who deeply deplored his death, April, 1853.

† Hugh Sinton Legaré, born in Charleston, 1789; died at Boston, 1843. He was an eminent politician and successful lawyer, as well as a brilliant writer.

‡ Charles Jourdain, *La Philosophie de S. Thomas d'Aquin*. 2 vols, 8vo. 1858.

something on Church History. Your words are golden as to the line we are to take on theology. Above all we ought to bear in mind that theology is not a stationary science, so that a man who says nothing that has not been said before does not march with his age. Nevertheless this philosophical view will be offensive to many. . . . Capes has taken Comte's *Catechism of Positivism* to write about it for August. Meynell is watching for the appearance of Hamilton's *Lectures* to review them; and I, of Dyer's *Modern History* for the same purpose. The June *Rambler* had a theological article, with one or two mistakes in it, on Laforet, by whom I know not.* There is no antithesis to Döllinger or the German divines, as in the case of Bossuet and the Romans, for certain reasons which we might discuss. Faber and Morris, if any, would be near the mark. Lots of new materials have been published for the life of St Charles, so that I fear Thompson's book† is not quite up to the mark, despite your favourable notice. I sent your paper on the Catholics‡ to Potts; it seems to me greatly improved and likely to be effective. Don't tell Veuillot that he will be complimented in the next *Rambler*, for there is an allusion to him not exactly in that strain. Meynell has done it.

* The article on "Laforet" was written by the Rev. Mr Bonus.

† *The Life of St Charles Borromeo*, by E. Healy Thompson, was reviewed by Simpson in the *Rambler*, June, 1858, p. 424. Mr Healy Thompson, a Cambridge Scholar, was ordained in the Established Church; became a Catholic in 1846; died at Cheltenham, 1891, where he had for twenty-three years devoted himself to literature.

‡ "The Influence of Catholics in England" above referred to.

Letter X

Dr Maguire's critique of the *Analecta*—Merits of Jaffé's great work and its value for history—His design not hostile to the Catholic Church, though he and his publisher are Jews—Vast collections of documents in the Papal *Regesta*—The work not intended to be theological—The exposure of Margotti's pamphlet

Aldenham, June 30, 1858.

I received Dr Maguire's paper* this morning and lost no time in reading it. As a critique of the *Analecta* and their way of doing business, it is excellent, and I can only complain that it is not severe in censure. That journal does no end of harm and is conducted in the worst and lowest spirit which orthodox and virtuous men are capable of. It is highly necessary that a firm protest should be made against a paper that exercises such imperious authority. But the rest of the article, so far as it touches Jaffé, is less complete and requires a little modification before it can appear. Dr. M. is a theologian and has overlooked the fact (as the Roman critic has done also) that the book† is written merely for the use of historians. Jaffé is well known as a diligent rather than able historical writer, and has published two useful works on the history of the empire in the twelfth century. The plan of his present work was suggested by the *Regesta*

* "German Jews and French Reviewers," printed in the *Rambler* for August, 1858, pp. 101-120.

† *Regesta pontificum Romanorum ab cond. Eccl. ad an.* 1198 (1851).

Imperii of Böhmer, the most learned and accurate of all historians, who has given an exact chronological abstract of all papers emanating from the emperors in the 9th-13th centuries, accompanying the documentary notices with exhaustive references to the historians, so that his work is as good as a complete history of the times. He also gives very full and instructive prefaces. Jaffé on a longer field confines himself to the mere facts and words of the documents. Had his design been hostile, he could have fulfilled it much better by following more closely his model, and giving such malicious extracts from the historians as he could easily have found in Greseler. The fury of the Roman critic is very easily explained by an enemy, by the fact that Jaffé as well as his publisher is a Jew and that the appearance of such a work by a young Jewish physician of Berlin is a most bitter censure on those who sit at the fountain-head of ecclesiastical learning and have done so little to extend it.

For the same reason I think it hardly just to say that it "would be an easy undertaking" to continue the work, seeing that 2,016 volumes of Pontifical *Regesta* are in the Vatican, for Jaffé may make pretty sure that he will not be allowed to use them. He is at work, however, on the continuation, and has been for the last eight years. The interest and importance of his book would be better described as historical. I think Dr M. dwells too much on the theological value of it.

As there is a short list of the most important ecclesiastical publications of Protestant Germany, it ought to be made complete. The additions of Oehler's *Tertul-*

*lian** and Otto's *Justin and the Apologists*† would make it so. If Dr Maguire is the author of the June paper on Laforet, pray tell him that Generationism as held by Klee has been recently condemned at Rome in the work of Frohschammer, a professor at Munich.

I rejoice at your exposure of Margotti.‡ I would, if I were you, say a word of respect for those who are somehow fighting the battle of religion in Piedmont, for though they may be, like this good man, slaves of the *Univers*, yet it is a contest in which we must greatly sympathize with the Catholic party, who have to go through real trouble for Catholicity. At least I would do this from motives of prudence in order not to give a fair opening to imputations of want of sympathy . . .

I received the *Atlantis* this morning; Arnold's *Alcibiades* and O'Hagan's *Joan of Arc* are open to criticism. Shall we not notice it in August?

* Two editions of Tertullian's *Opera* were published by F. Oehler: ed. major, 3 vols, Leipsig, 1853, and ed. minor in 1854.

† Carl T. Johann v. Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christ. Sæc. Secundi*, 1851-81.

‡ An article by Simpson entitled "Italian Statistics" in the *Rambler* for August, 1858, on a pamphlet called *Roma e Londra confronti*, by Giacomo Margotti. Simpson also contributed the first article, called "France," to this number.

Letter XI

Danger of contempt of the ascetical and dislike of prayer—Intellectual contempt of fellow-Catholics to be guarded against—Döllinger's common-sense exposition of doctrine

Aldenham, July 2, 1858.

——'s letter explains in a way I was hardly prepared for the anomalies which it was impossible not to observe in his life and conversation. I did not hear his prophecy to you about original sin, but it says much for his own want of trust. What struck me most was his contempt for everything ascetical, and his dislike for prayer under the guise of weak health. Intellectual contempt for fellow-Catholics has brought many men, within my knowledge, to nearly the same pass. The difficulty with him is increased by his impulsive character and by his impatience of laborious study. I fear that everything which gives him annoyance or discomfort will confirm his present disposition, so I vote that we in particular should be very careful in our communications with him. . . He wrote to me some time ago to know when Döllinger was coming over, and to make sure of meeting him. Now I understand the cause of this eagerness, it strikes me as a very fortunate thing. Döllinger has a great liking for him; and his cool matter-of-fact, common-sense exposition of doctrine would I think be peculiarly suitable to ——'s state of mind.

Letter XII

Acton's paper on "Buckle" is keeping him up all night—Negotiations in regard to the *Dublin Review*—The advantages of the proposed union with the *Rambler*—The circulation of the *Atlantis*

Aldenham, July 11, [1858].

Buckle is keeping me up all night.* We shall have too many *reviews* with "Guizot," therefore your paper on France will be highly opportune. Buckle will be miserably done, and I will never review a bad book again. Your French article† is very original, and much to the present purpose. I have only marked one or two things. For instance, Talleyrand won't do as the representative of official bourgeoisie, and your witty Abbé Simon was an infidel deputy.

Manning and not MacMullen is clearly right. I had no copy of the circular sent to me, and the Cardinal, I have no doubt, would have written to me with unction, if he had thought of my taking the matter up. I am glad you look forward to a double shot next January. I cannot make out what Burns wants, but the two could be kept perfectly distinct. Politics are much better in a monthly garb than a quarterly, and the short notices ought, I think, to be confined to the *Rambler*. We might get up the

* This article on "Mr Buckle's Philosophy of History" appeared in the *Rambler* for August, 1858, pp. 88-104.

† Entitled "France," and appearing in the same number, pp. 73-88.

novel department with greater care, and everybody looks to the *Rambler* for your " Old English Catholics." All this would exclusively belong to our monthly.

As to the difficulty with regard to the *Atlantis* Newman writes to me this morning: "To make the chance of mutual interference still less, I wrote on receipt of your letter to a friend in Dublin to express what I had on other grounds felt, namely the desirableness of the *Atlantis* contracting its range of subjects, and of even confining itself to scientific." Of course he must be rebuked for this, but it shows his mind towards the plan, and starts also, in my mind, the question how far the *Dublin* might safely become a receptacle, as Manning says, for regular treatises. The combination with the *Rambler* would, I imagine, give it a rather more serious character.

As to Burns, I do not think he is inclined to do anything bold. He talks of everybody being ready for sacrifices at first, etc., whereas a regular payment to contributors is the first thing to look to in trying to revive the *Dublin*. Unless he shows some enterprise, I expect it will be no go. I see the *Tablet* has collapsed at the same time as the *Dublin*. If we take the *Dublin*, could you not get up an elaborate article founded on some considerable *inedita*, and then print the article separately with the documents appended? It would be a good advertisement. I would do the same on some questions of modern continental history, about which I have important unpublished matter. Moreover, the present occasion seems a likely one to break down Newman's rule about not writing for reviews. I expect we could get something out of him.

They print (? sell) 1,000 copies of the *Atlantis*. I did not know that copying could be done so cheap in Belgium as I find it can by your article. I will have lots of things copied for me out of the library of Burgundy, where there are rare treasures for modern history.

P.S.—Pray look at the article on Buckle in the *Quarterly*, which I've not seen, and be ready to make any correction which that may suggest to my detestable article.

Letter XIII

Question as to the editing of the *Dublin Review*—Burns to take it over from Richardson—*Rambler* and *Dublin* to run together as necessary one to the other—Döllinger is coming over to England

Aldenham, July 23, 1858.

I wrote to Russell at Ushaw privately, saying that if no better plan was devised etc. he might tell the Cardinal that I should be ready to carry on the *Dublin Review*, provided Burns got it out of Richardson's hands. They have accepted eagerly, and say I have relieved them from a great fix, and are quite of the mind that Burns would do better than Richardson. They also promise to support it as much as possible. They think it might be slightly modified so as to receive the *Rambler* into it. I daresay they thought they had me there, but I have explained to Russell as clear as day how the *Dublin* could not exist without the *Rambler*, how they are necessary to each other, how they will agree and make harmony like the music of the spheres, etc., etc. I have also by this

day's post told Burns of it, and spirited him up to the thing, laying down the conditions. There it rests, therefore, at this present. . . Döllinger's coming will be no small help, over and against the honorabilities. The point now is how Burns will come round Richardson, and whether he will accept my conditions. One of them is that there should be no short notices in the *Dublin*.

Letter XIV

Negotiations for the *Dublin* still going on—Begs Simpson to come to Aldenham and induce Manning and MacMullen to do so also—Is working hard at Dutch pamphlets at the Hague—Döllinger thought a passage in the last *Rambler* "likely to offend"

The Hague, Wednesday, August 25, 1858.

I have only just learnt by letters which I found at Brussels that the Cardinal has broken off the negotiation about the *Dublin Review*. We should have got up a better January number than I expect they will. Bagshawe does not write as if the Cardinal was sanguine. Be sure to come to Aldenham on the Monday, and bring MacMullen with you, and encourage Manning to come, if you see him—he was not sure.

I am up to my chin in Dutch pamphlets of the time of the Duke of Alba; but I shall be in London by the end of next week. Döllinger went to Munich, from the mountains where he was staying, for a day or two, on purpose to look up passages on the questions started by Capes's paper. I had written to Ward to engage him for the *Dublin*, and got a foolish,

friendly contradictory denial in reply, in which he complains only of my saying that Petavius and Bossuet were great divines, and concludes therefrom that our views are so different we could not agree. . . I hope to be industrious during the winter. I am afraid that I have only some short notices for October. Did our August number offend others besides Ward? By an odd coincidence Döllinger one day cited your July saying* about papal robbery as likely to offend, though he thinks it perfectly true. Faber made through Morris an ingenious and paternally solicitous attempt to get the censorship of our *Dublin* for Dalgairns!

Letter XV

Döllinger in London—The passage about St Augustine which gave offence is approved by Döllinger—Does not approve of what Simpson wrote about it under "Correspondence"—Döllinger wishes to see the paper S. had written on Original Sin

16 *Bruton Street, Thursday, September*, 1858.

Döllinger, who is here, is fattening with laughter at our divines in the Augustinian dispute. I should have let Maguire, whom I met to-day, know that I was the author of the offensive passage,† only I thought he knew it probably already—and moreover I think it must not be allowed to drop. I could not subscribe to what you have written under "corre-

* In the article "The Influence of Catholics in England," p. 17.

† The passage in question is to be found in an article on "Bossuet" in the *Rambler* for June, 1858: "That he (Bossuet) held the Port-Royalist doctrine on the subject of divine grace is incontestable. He considered himself, rightly or wrongly, a thorough Augustinian."

spondence,"* and propose to show why I do not deliberately hold that errors condemned by the Church are to be found in the works of the Doctor Gratiæ. I think it is worth following up, in order that men may learn that we do not choose even our illustrations without deliberation, and are ready to justify everything we write. There could be no better opportunity than this, as it will at the same time help to break down that narrow and invincible ignorance with which our writings are judged. This must be done, not in my name, but in the name of the *Rambler*, and the only difficulty will be to avoid contradicting what was said in the last number.

Be sure and be at Aldenham on Monday for dinner. Döllinger has never read the paper on Original Sin,† and I am not sure I have that number. I think him strongly inclined to agree with you, so perhaps you will think it worth while to bring it down. Do not let Meynell write λογος without an accent. Owen's autobiography‡ will give matter for a new article in your misbelieving series.

* "A correspondent has, with great kindness, warned us that umbrage has been taken at a sentence referring to St Augustine in our last number, and has told us that inferences have been drawn from it injurious to our reputation for orthodoxy. In order to remove all ground from such suspicions, we protest that we never intended to identify any errors which the Church has proscribed with the teaching of 'the greatest doctor of the West,' when properly understood; and we most sincerely hold and profess whatever the Holy See has propounded, and condemn what it has condemned on the questions of grace, free-will and justification. With respect to the terms we used, we venture to remind our readers that we might call Plato the father of scepticism, without identifying sceptical errors with the real teaching of the father of philosophy."—*Rambler*, August, 1859, p. 216.

† This refers to the article which appeared in the *Rambler* for May, 1856, entitled "On Original Sin."

‡ This was probably the *Life by Himself* of Robert Owen, "the Socialist," which appeared this year, in which also the author died.

Letter XVI

Has translated the Baron Eckstein's paper on Guizot—Approves of Simpson's two papers on Combe's "Phrenology" and the martyr "William Harrington"—Carlyle's *Frederick II of Prussia* is of little real value

16 *Bruton Street, Thursday* [*October*, 1858.]

I have finished Eckstein* as well as I could, nearly literally. I do not see why your phrenological paper† should be in any way altered, for I read it with great pleasure and contentment. You do not give the date of Harrington's‡ letter, and, saying he was taken in 1593, refer his letter to documents of 1592. Both are interesting lives and have more than usual individuality. Oakeley wrote yesterday for an exposition of my proposal, which I went and gave him. We seemed to agree on most points, and he talks of advising the Cardinal to come to terms with me.

Carlyle's book§ is of little real value, and more affected than anything yet written in prose.

The Professor is in better spirits as our departure approaches.

* The Baron Eckstein was the author of the two articles on Guizot in the October and November numbers of this year. Also he wrote subsequently on de Lamennais in May, 1859, and attached to that article is a note on Eckstein's life, contributed by Acton.

† "Mr George Combe and his Phrenology," which was printed in the November number, pp. 373-388.

‡ "William Harrington," ibid., pp. 399-407.

§ *History of Frederick II of Prussia, called Frederick the Great*, reviewed by Acton in the *Rambler*, December, 1858, p. 429.

Letter XVII

Sends half of Döllinger's paper on "The Paternity of Jansenism"—No one in the present state of theological studies in England will be interested in it—Newman approved of the original statement.

Monday, November 15, 1858.

Here is half of Döllinger's precious letter.* The rest to-morrow. Do see that the phraseology will do. Don't forget to prefix a short note—that we are happy to enrich our pages with the following letter which we have received from a divine equally well known in England and abroad—not for the purpose of reconciling people to our expression, for that we cannot hope for until theological matters are better and more generally understood in this country,† but for the sake of such a specimen of learning, etc., and because we could not allow the accusation made against us to affect or delude those who bear us no ill will. I am sure you will do it much better than I can suggest. I don't know whether we can add that it is some consolation

* On "The Paternity of Jansenism" in the *Rambler* for December, 1858, pp. 361-373.

† Writing to Simpson on February 15 of this year, Dr Ward made use of almost the same expressions as to the state of theological learning: "I most fully agree with you, not only (as of course I do) in the extreme interest of theology, but also in your criticism that it needs entire reconstruction to meet the exigencies of the day. For a really competent theologian, it seems to me no less requisite that he shall have a general knowledge of the present state of mental and physical science, than that he shall know the *loci theologici* themselves. I always tell my pupils here (St Edmund's, Old Hall) that, as far as I can see, at the present time the Catholic world to the Protestant world is in much the same relation as barbarians to civilized men."

for those who have at heart the reputation of English theology to know that not a single divine whose opinion deserved attention mistook or disliked the passage, inasmuch as Newman thoroughly approved of it, and was the only person in England who did. Faber was very wrathful, and Morris is miserable about it. I feel almost certain that not a convert will be made by Döllinger's admirable paper.

Letter XVIII

The question of uniting the *Dublin* and the *Rambler* still under discussion—Proposes that Newman shall have the direction—Simpson's letter to the Cardinal as to the review of his *Last Four Popes* is approved—He is preparing his article on Montalembert

Aldenham Park, Tuesday, November 16, 1858.

The longer your metaphysics are the better, it strikes me. My notion of a quarterly is that there ought not to be too many articles or too short ones. A good article is better long than so short as to make room for a less good one; twenty-five to fifty pages seem to me the limits. Abundance of short notices would allow the articles themselves to be less reviews and more of dissertations. The possible *Dublin* is, however, a very problematical thing. Oakeley writes that it is still *sub judice*, between Thompson and Ward, and that at a meeting in a few days an *alternative* (as I read it) will be drawn up, and then I am to hear further from him. The plan I was so good as to propose, that "Newman should have a theological control, but no positive share in the direc-

tion" did not appear satisfactory to all parties. Perhaps they thought this formula ingenious. I shall put them into a fix by saying I should be glad to give Newman as much share in the direction as he would take.

"Montalembert"* will perhaps fill about four or five pages. Pray get the note N † corrected. Döllinger sent me a bit of it which was wanting to-day.‡

Your letter to the Cardinal§ is in tone and sub-

* "The Count de Montalembert," by Acton, in the *Rambler* for December, 1858, pp. 421-428. He also contributed the short notice of "Carlyle."

† A note on the article, "The Count de Montalembert," which referred to the condemnation of the Count, the news of which had reached England after the article had been in type. See in *Rambler*, ibid., p. 432.

‡ Mr Simpson's share in the December number of the *Rambler* was extraordinary: (1) "The Phrenology of Combe"; (2) "Belgium"; (3) "B. Harrington, Martyr"; (4) "Mansel"; (5) "Ursula"—that is five articles, besides other things.

§ Mr Simpson's letter here referred to was sent to Cardinal Wiseman on November 20, 1858. He says: "I gather from a note that Sir John Acton has written to me that your Eminence is under the impression that the *Rambler* endorses Tierney's view of Dr Lingard's cardinalate. This impression is so contrary to that which I intended to convey that I feel it necessary to write an explanation of my real meaning. I regret very much that the idea should have got abroad that the *Rambler* is conducted in a spirit of personal opposition to your Eminence, and that persons should busy themselves in picking out sentences from nearly every number which they distort and interpret after their sinister fashion to widen a breach which unfortunately exists. I protest to your Eminence, as I have had occasion to protest to others, that they were not intended, and that any impertinent reference to your Eminence was far removed from the ideas both of the writers and of the editor. . ." By return of post Cardinal Wiseman wrote thanking Simpson for his letter and the kindly expressions contained in it, and accepting them in their fullest meaning.

The *Rambler* in April this year had reviewed the Cardinal's *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, and had noticed the passage in which he spoke of Lammenais' having been destined by Pope Leo XII for a place in the College of Cardinals. Canon Tierney attacked this view, and desired to substitute the name of Dr Lingard. Cardinal Wiseman replied to the Canon's arguments in a pamphlet letter addressed to the Chapter of Westminster. In acknowledging this pamphlet, Simpson told the Cardinal: "(1) That your reply has convinced us that there was no ground for looking on

stance exactly corresponding to mine, and I think the step a good one. So long as we do not say anything, unscrupulous accusers, saying falsehoods, will naturally be believed, and as I told the Cardinal, no amount of caution in editing and writing can remove existing impressions or alter the light in which each number is looked upon. I like the boldness with which you protest that no impertinent reference to His Eminence is ever intended.

The Wilkses are newspaper writers, and I should not think able to write on the three archbishops without a present practical object. As to Crewe, it might be worth while to point out that the Albigenses gave the Catholics no choice; they were the aggressors, and being weaker were exterminated; and that their tenets were dangerous not as religious only, but as social; the State—every State—was as much menaced by them as the Church. It was not a purely religious war.

Letter XIX

Asks Simpson to pass a critical eye on his article on Montalembert and to correct anything—Simpson's philosophy has been attributed to Acton—Has reviewed Carlyle for the next *Rambler*

Aldenham Park, Sunday, November, 1858.

Pray read with a critical eye and pen what I have written.* I have no misgivings as to the truth, but I am not so sure of the wisdom of it. It seemed

Lingard as cardinal; (2) that the correct version of the allocution given by you puts a new face on the matter; (3) that it was very unlikely that both Lingard and Lamennais should have been appointed."

* i.e., in the article on Montalembert as above.

ungracious to take this opportunity to go more into the errors of Montalembert's earlier career. Indeed I am afraid I have done it too much as it is. I could not omit the question about Spain, without omitting the point of censure altogether, and it was a passage I was very much provoked with.* Correct everything you can except the punctuation of the last sentence. Can you think of any conceit by way of title? Of course there is another side of political doctrine, which I have not touched on here except in mentioning the *Concordat* with Austria. I shall have, however, occasion to dwell on that afterwards. Do read Fitzgerald's letter in the *Tablet*. I have sent it to Montalembert, who does not read the *Tablet*. It is no use for us to go disputing with other English or Irish Catholics on general political principles. I think such controversies would be endless and hopeless. If my quotations are hackneyed, pray expunge them, ditto if Barabbas† is profane. I do not know enough about the persecution of the editor of the Catholic review in Bavaria to say more about it, but it seemed unjust to overlook it.

I do not attach so much importance to the impertinence of our note, but it will do very well as it stands. If your philosophy is attributed to me, I shall revenge myself by writing a piece of metaphysics. You see I have fattened Carlyle,‡ having read him. He will bear much shortening.

* See in the article ut sup. p. 426.
† Ibid. p. 428.
‡ In the short notice of him in the December *Rambler*, 1858.

Letter XX

Montalembert's condemnation by the State necessitates a note—The note appears in the *Rambler* and was written by Acton—He is taking a paper of Simpson on Whewell, to Newman—All expectation of uniting with the *Dublin* is over—He will sound Newman about "quartering" the *Atlantis*

Aldenham Park, Friday, November 26, 1858.

Montalembert's condemnation is rather awkward for our article. A few changes, as "late" for "present" prosecution, and a change in one passage in the last page but one would suit the article to present circumstances. But I am inclined to think it would be wiser to add a note saying it was in type before the news came, and adding perhaps a compliment. May I leave this to you? One might add that the Catholic view of the matter, which the French Church might be expected to take, is that expressed in the words of St Ambrose (Ep. 40-2): "Neque imperiale est libertatem dicendi denegare, neque sacerdotale, quod sentias non dicere. . . . Siquidem hoc interest inter bonos et malos principes, quod boni libertatem amant, servitutem improbi. Nihil etiam in sacerdote tam periculosum apud Deum, tam turpe apud homines, quam quod sentiat non libere denuntiare."*

It would be presumptuous in me to venture an opinion as to the validity of your metaphysical article. I have put the allusion to the German criticism on

* Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* XVI, col. 1101, quoted in the note, p. 432 of the December *Rambler*.

Whewell in an authentic shape, which you will be able to correct in the proof. I shall be at Birmingham on Monday, being due in Worcestershire to-morrow, and will take the paper with me to give to Newman. If you object, send me a line to the Queen's Hotel, Birmingham. I have lost all expectation, and I confess all desire, of having the *Dublin Review*. I will talk to Newman about quartering the *Atlantis*.

Letter XXI

Forwards a portion of his article on "Political Thoughts on the Church"—Is much dissatisfied with it—It has been written between midnight and bedtime—Cannot finish it as he hoped—Begs S. to look to the quotations—Is quite incapable of writing in a hurry

Aldenham, Thursday, December 16, 1858.

The bottled wisdom you spoke of has come out in the shape of ditch water. This is about half—the rest to-morrow.* It has been almost entirely written in the last week, during the interval between midnight and bedtime, and is, I am afraid, grievously confused. I wish you would keep your "Martineau" to relieve the dullness of this affair.† If you can get any one to correct it, do. I wish I had succeeded in showing the truths as clearly as I see them.

Friday, December 17.

I have been swelling out my foolishness beyond measure in order that there might be matter at least

* This was the MS. of an article which appeared in the *Rambler* for January, 1859, on "Political Thoughts on the Church," pp. 30-49.

† Simpson's "Martineau's Studies" appeared in the February number.

to occupy space, so that I have not got the end quite done yet. Sunday intervenes, so it cannot arrive till Monday morning, about two or three pages more. I have put in lots of quotations because of the address of some of the views. You can at any rate strike out those that seem irrelevant or put the Latin into notes. You know how incapable I am of writing in a hurry.

1859

Letter XXII

Suggests the printing of a paper on Barrillon's Embassy, 1596, and sends notes—Acton's own article on "The Catholic Press" will be twelve pages—Has seen the Cardinal, and had a long talk with Newman—The latter's interest in the *Rambler* and his advice to avoid theological topics—Newman's opinion as to Simpson's articles

Aldenham, New Year's Day, 1859.

The paper relating to Barrillon's embassy has not been printed and deserves to be.* I have appended a few frivolous notes, at your discretion. Thuanus† relates that Burghley wished to introduce conditions favourable to the Huguenots, to which Barrillon, himself a Huguenot, though a very loose one, would not consent. I suppose he thought he ought to accept as few conditions as possible. The four passages at the end, from the *affaires étrangères*, are printed in *Memoires de Bellièvre et de Silleri*, 1696, and can be quoted therefrom.

I have ventured on one or two suggestions in the text of the other paper.‡ The allusion to the dispute between Hadrian and Frederic on the word "beneficium" is happy and quite historical. There is no need for your caution, for it is perfectly true. Both papers are

* Printed in the article called "Foreign Protestant View of England in 1596" in the *Rambler*, February, 1859, pp. 137-146.

† Jacques Auguste de Thou or Thuanus; *Historiarum sui temp.* (1553-1617).

‡ "Bureaucracy," by Simpson, printed in February, 1859.

of the same date, for the first year of Gregory XV is 1621. Are you quite sure you are right (p. 2 of the extract) in translating "tirannaggiata" "usurped"? Tyrannus means, in mediæval Latin, a prince whom, for *de jure* or *de facto* wrongs, it is advisable to smite under the fifth rib. I do not know whether it has quite the same comprehensive meaning in the Italian participle.

My article will be, I suppose, twelve full pages,* together with a few short notices. I will not promise one on Gregory VII, though the notice in the *Tablet* was by Formby. It strikes me that Capes means the *ipse dixit* of a saint like St Austin, not of a pope.† As to his proposed letter, the title ‡ would be capital, but is there anything tangible to write upon? At any rate it had better be referred to Newman. Where is that scripture he seems to allude to—"Nunquid indiget Dominus vestro mendacio?" § I should like to quote it, but I daren't quote when I do not know the place, etc. Stokes is excellent.

I saw the Cardinal, who said nothing of interest, and spoke to me just like anybody else. But he was altogether low. Stonor, on seeing me, exclaimed: "Hallo! what's brought you up here to London? Jansenius?" I made Wallis' acquaintance, who, at first talking, pleased me much. The only notability was a Parsee, Jeejeebhoy, from Bombay, not the famous

*"The Catholic Press," printed in February, 1859, pp. 73-90.

† In an article called "Cæsarism, Diabolism and Christianity" in the same number.

‡ The letter signed "C" on "Cæsarism, Diabolism and Education" was printed in the February number, 1859, pp. 126-137.

§ Job xiii, 7.

merchant of that name, who came out of a legitimate curiosity to see a live cardinal, but was commonly taken for Mgr Persico, and treated accordingly. I had a three hours' talk with the venerable Newman, who came out at last with his real sentiments to an extent which startled me with respect both to things and persons, as Ward, Dalgairns, etc., etc.; natural inclination of men in power to tyrannize; ignorance and presumption of would-be theologians. I did not think he would ever cast aside his diplomacy and buttonment so entirely, and was quite surprised at the intense interest he betrayed in the *Rambler*. He was quite miserable when I told him the news and moaned for a long time, rocking himself backwards and forwards over the fire, like an old woman with a toothache. He thinks the move provoked both by the hope of breaking down the *R.* and by jealousy of Döllinger He asked whether we suspected any one, and at last inclined to the notion that the source is in Brompton. He has no present advice, being ignorant of the course of such affairs in Rome, except that we should declare, if you can make up your mind to do so, that we do not treat theology in our pages. He thinks such a declaration would go a great way. If you wish, it can be done at the end of my paper, when I come to speak of *our* position and aims, subject, as the whole article will more particularly be, to your correction. He wants us to have rather more levity and profaneness, less theology and learning. A good story, he thinks, would turn away wrath, and he enjoys particularly your friendly encounters with Bentham,*

* The article on "Bentham," by Simpson, appeared in October, 1858.

Combe,* Buckle† and the like. On the other hand, he wants our more ponderous efforts to be devoted to the *Atlantis*, which he would be ready to quarter, Longmans urging him thereto and Sullivan promising 400 subscribers in Ireland. There are some difficulties in the way, but I think we can promise him contributions with willingness. He has an unhappy way of printing scientific articles separately with other pagings, but to include all articles that treat their subject, whatever it may be, scientifically, under the head of science. I have promised him a letter attacking this plan, and he promised to send me the results of further reflection on the course to be pursued by us. He is most entirely friendly, and considered the *Rambler* invaluable, to be kept, according to Madame Swetchine's answer to the "vers Latin, Quis custodiet custodes?" for the authorities.

Letter XXIII

Forwards a remarkable letter from Newman containing suggestions for the conduct of *Rambler*—The separation of the political and religious orders effected by Christianity—The meaning of a Concordat and the late introduction of compromises in the history of Church—Newman's broad idea of the meaning of theology

Aldenham, January 4, 1859

I send you Newman's very remarkable letter. Although his recommendation that the *Rambler* should be at the same time instructive, clever and amusing eliminates me from the list of contributors, I believe

* Mr George Combe and his Phrenology," in December, pp. 373-388.
† "Mr Buckle's Thesis and Method," in July, 1858, pp. 27-42.

his advice the best, though I do not feel sanguine about the effect which our announcement of not treating theology will have. People are quite as sensitive about other things as about theology. By all means do Martineau. * Formby has got no light about Bureaucracy. If you set to work on the subject,† I will send you a note or two, being familiar with the acting of the system.

Capes's letter ‡ contains a great deal that confirms what I meant to say in my article and that strikes me as true and to the purpose. St Augustine was not the only one he would call a Manichee. Gerson says (opp. ii, 253) "Civile dominium, seu politicum, est dominium peccati occasione introductum," and Dante calls it "remedium contra infirmitatem peccati." But it will not do to press the analogy with Manicheism too far—only as one speaks of prostitution among public men. It is quite wrong, but not heretical, to give the State a sinful origin, like war. Is it right (p. 5) to include domestic in civil society? I imagine the Fourth Commandment and the Sacrament of Matrimony give it a place in the religious department. Then in p. 8 it must be observed that there could be no conflict between political and religious obligations before Christianity separated the two orders. The Fathers did not fully understand the political consequences of Christianity which it was the business of the middle ages to evolve. Calvinism, as Capes says truly, afterwards mixed up the religious and political order, overlooking

* An article on "Martineau's 'Studies of Christianity'" appeared in February, 1859, pp. 90-104.

† The result appears in the same number, pp. 113-126.

‡ The letter "Cæsarism," etc., above noticed, in the same number, p. 126.

the political, as Machiavelli did by overlooking the spiritual, one led astray by the Jews, the other by the Gentiles. At pp. 13-14 a quotation from Burke occurred to me (Works, 1, 404: writing to a Catholic): "In your situation I would be so far a friend to the court, as not to give occasion to every friend of the constitution to become an enemy to me and my cause."

Is it true that time (p. 17) is a *portion* of eternity? As to the Concordat (pp. 21-22) what he says will, I think, hardly stand fire. The idea of compromise is of modern growth, but so is the Concordat altogether. It is a consequence of the obscuration in the minds of men—statesmen especially—of Capes's very true and just notion that the Church and the State have the same origin and the same ultimate objects. When this was understood, there were no Concordats. There was none for instance with Charlemagne, at the revival of the Empire, or with Otho. The first thing we call by that name is the Callixtine Concordat of 1122, but the name does not belong to it, and was unheard of at the time. It is first used early in the fifteenth century, when the old harmony was dissolved and real compromises needed and made, when the States no longer agreed with the principles of the Church, the pope tried to bind them by compact and agreement, purchased by some sacrifice on his part and therefore the more sacred, to a certain line of conduct which they would no longer follow from principle.

Newman does not take the term "theology" so strictly as you seem to understand it. For instance, he would not allow his article on St Cyril to be theology. Then he thinks more of the effect on others, of the

occasion which it gives to complain of imprudence on the part of laymen, than of the real danger of it. Such articles as this on Martineau, which I have not had time to read because of Morris's sermon, but will read to-morrow, particularly suit his taste. I have told him (1) that our theology was not all done by laymen; (2) that history and politics startle good people just as much as heresy. Altogether his view would be satisfied if there was less Latin in my articles and if we avoid *ex professo* theological articles with theological titles to them, and affirm that we do not profess to teach theology. I suppose *Blackwood* nearly the model he has in his eye. I propose to come it strong (and long, I hope not wrong) in the paper on literary prospects, on the cache-cache system Capes attacks.* An article and a letter in the same number agreeing thoroughly on the point will play into each others' hands.

Letter XXIV

Approves of Simpson's critique on Martineau—A rare tract on the life of Bellarmine—The blunders in the Bible of Sixtus V corrected by Bellarmine—Simpson and the *Saturday Review* agree in one point in criticism of Marshall

Aldenham, January 9, 1859.

Your critique of Martineau† is as good and powerful as usual. In treating of the position of laymen in the development of religious knowledge, will it not be important to speak always as replying to Martineau?

* "The Catholic Press," printed as the first article in February.

† Noted in the previous letter.

The addition at 18b is capital, and the other passage seems quite irreproachable. The passage is from *Vita Venerabilis Card. Rob. Bellarmini, S.J., quam ipsemet scripsit*, p. 31.* It is a book extraordinarily rare. No bio- or biblio-graphical writer that I have seen knows of it, and the same is probably the case with our readers. It was printed, perhaps privately, at the time when his beatification was discussed. I possess it bound up with the opinions of several eminent cardinals upon his claims. I propose to quote another passage in my article, which will also, I think, be to the purpose. He relates how Sixtus V put him on the Index, and describes how good-natured he was, in preventing his (Pope Sixtus') Bible from appearing with such gross blunders as it contained, and correcting it himself before it was published. I thought of finishing with this quotation unless you think I had better not. Will it do to quote the page of the same rare book in two different articles?† Or shall we leave them in one case to find the passage themselves? By the bye the life is in the third person, and he calls himself "N."

Bentley's new quarterly is, I suppose, to be edited by Hughes [Tom Brown] and Watson, the writer of French articles for the *Saturday*. If it is so, we must keep an eye upon it, as Watson is a man to be got at by judicious treatment. He says he would be a Catholic, if he could be one of the school of Bossuet, but that now we have changed into quite a different set. If he ever

* This passage, p. 100 of the article, contained Bellarmine's account of the way he told Pope Clement VIII that he was not a trained theologian. It was suggested for insertion by Acton in a previous letter.

† The passage appears in Acton's article "The Catholic Press" in the *Rambler*, February, 1859, p. 89.

utters such a sentiment, we could down him with a very interesting dissertation on old and new Catholicism. I imagine it must have riled Marshall to find you coinciding in one point of criticism with the *Saturday*, which review by the way makes an unusual blunder this time, talking of the fair of Beaucaire interesting the Normans, as that of Leipzig the Germans, whereas Beaucaire is in Provence.

Letter XXV

Aristotle's teaching as to the supremacy of the law—The difficulty of keeping up in a monthly magazine a controversy with a weekly —Simpson's note upon Bright is delightful—Correction of a saying of the XII Tables

Aldenham, January 13, 1859.

When Aristotle says that where the law is not supreme there is no πολιτεία, he contrasts law with personal or collective will—ὅπου μὴ νόμοι, not ὅπου μὴ νόμοι ἄρχ. You do him no injustice, but this passage is not quite fairly quoted and might be objected to. What immediately follows is excellent *—the contrast is between the ancient modern and the mediæval state. A learned bureaucratic writer declares the Teutonic race incapable of forming a real state. . . . I have said in the article I am just going to send you much to the same effect as yours, p. 16. There would be an admirable harmony in the whole number if you will print both this and Martineau. I see it is too much for your pugnacity to allow blows to be administered impune

* In Simpson's article, "Bureaucracy," p. 115,

to us. Yet I think, with reference to the end of your article against the *Tablet*,* that it is very hard to carry on controversy with weekly papers; and where a dispute cannot be carried through thoroughly and decisively, it seems better to disdain engaging in it. They are sure to attack us every time, and it is hard to be always replying to them. Presently we shall be able to represent ourselves as mild simple people, the objects of constant, violent and unprovoked attack. Your note on Bright † is delightful.

The XII Tables said, "Salus populi suprema lex," instead of "Jus cujusque suprema lex." ‡

Letter XXVI

Newman's design for the *Atlantis*—The German method of critical study—The quality which makes a book an advance—Newman's essay on St Cyril a real bit of theology above most other modern treatises—It established a minute point, but was an advance—Science valueless unless pursued without regard to consequences

Aldenham, January 19, 1859.

. . . . I do not imagine that any change in the *Dublin* will have any effect on Newman's design, if it can be carried out in spite of other difficulties. He sees so many obstacles that he is a long time deciding upon a plan which he in general approves of. He

* The article called "The Royal Commission and the *Tablet*" in the same February number, pp. 113-126, was attributed to Simpson, but in reality was written by Mr Stokes, as also was the article in the January number, called "The Royal Commission on Education."

† A note appended to Simpson's article on "Bureaucracy," p. 125.

‡ p. 115.

seems to have no confidence in the support the University is likely to continue to the *Atlantis*—I mean pecuniary support. . . . As to the obnoxious formula which you attribute to me, I do not generally use it before people who are not likely to admit it, least of all, therefore, to ——. But it was necessary to intimate as delicately as I could that I did not think he knew much about it. So I said something to this effect: "I daresay there are not three people in England who approved of the passage,* but I am not aware that the number of those is greater who have studied both St Augustine and the works of the Jansenists in the original sources, and who have not derived their notions from mere compendia, whose opinion, therefore, deserves the smallest consideration." . . . Dalgairns said that all Germans struck him as having something wrong about them. So I told him in my answer that "I hoped his bad opinion would not prevent him from studying them, which would probably diminish the severity of his judgement, and would materially add to its weight.". . . .

On reading your note again I am provoked to a further explanation of the phenomenon that I pay no attention to Faber, whom you call a forward theologian, and for whose talents we have so much respect. The Germans have a word, *Quellenmässig=ex ipsissimis fontibus*, and another, *Wissenschaftlichkeit*, which is nearly equivalent to the Platonic ἐπιστήμη as opposed to αἴσθησις, δόξα, μνήμη, etc. When a book of theology, history or any other science is destitute of these

* The passage about St Augustine, which had given offence to many the previous year.

essential qualities, it belongs to a wholly different category, and, however meritorious it is in its proper sphere, is not treated or spoken of seriously. I might have Gibbon or Grote by heart, I should yet have no real, original, scientific knowledge of Roman or Grecian history, though I might make a great show of it and eclipse a better scholar. So in theology I might know profoundly all the books written by divines since the Council of Trent, but I should be no theologian unless I studied painfully, and in the sources, the genesis and growth of the doctrines of the Church. A theologian cannot choose between the Fathers, the scholastic writers or the modern schools, any more than a historian can choose whether he will read Livy or Polybius to write his history of the Punic war. Now, I went through a three years' course of this kind of study of theology, so that, although I did not exhaust any subject, and am, therefore, no authority on any question, yet I know very well the method on which it is necessary to proceed, and can at once detect a writer who, even with immense reading of theologians, is but a dilettante in theology. That's why I said Newman's essay on St Cyril, which on a minute point was original and progressive, was a bit of theology, which all the works of Faber, Morris, Ward and Dalgairns will never be. They have all got a *regia via* which leads them astray, and for scientific purposes all their labour is wasted. It is the absence of scientific method and of original learning in nearly all even of our best writers that makes it impossible for me to be really interested in their writings. *Literally*, to my judgment, they are to be classed with

Formby's *Bible History* rather than with Newman's *Essay*, or Möhler's *Symbolik*, and this no talent can redeem. Altogether this is almost an unknown idea amongst us in England. It is what I attempted to urge in my last paper.* Everything else has only a momentary, passing importance; it is like skirmishing and sharpshooting in a battle, "*tant que la garde n'a pas donné*," as Napoleon said. ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα is the motto of almost all our literature; and that is why, as I say, no progress can be made. Science is valueless unless pursued without regard to consequences or to application—only what the Germans call a *subjective* safeguard is required. I did not go farther into this in the article, partly because it was already too long, and partly because I did not think you would agree with it. You want things to be brought to bear, to have an effect. I think our studies ought to be all but purposeless. They want to be pursued with chastity, like mathematics. This, at least, is my profession of faith.

Letter XXVII

Simpson's paper on architecture is excellent—For the technical knowledge Acton has the "admiration of ignorance"—Considers Gothic art a part of the Christian revival by which it is distinguished from the pagan revival of the fifteenth century—Thinks periodical literature not consistent with his studies

Aldenham, Monday [*February* 1, 1859].

I had not time to write before I left London to tell you that your paper on architecture† seems to

* "Political Thoughts on the Church," January, 1859.

† "The Development of Gothic Architecture," printed in the *Rambler* for May, 1859.

me excellent, and particularly remarkable for technical knowledge, for which I have the vacant admiration of ignorance. My own notions are derived from the study of history more than of art, and are as narrow as in politics. I believe that Gothic art declined in an age which was fatal to other productions characteristic of the middle ages, and especially to those ideas of which art is the instrument and symbol, and that it was forgotten as completely as mediæval history, law, poetry etc., during the ages in which the pagan revival prevailed. Steffens, an excellent German, said well that Cologne Cathedral was a discovery of the nineteenth century as Pompeii had been of the eighteenth. I can only consider Gothic art as a part of the mediaeval revival which distinguishes our age and seems to me as important as the revival of pagan learning in the fifteenth century. It is the culminating point of my reactionary and contracted opinions that a Grecian building, especially a church, seems to me as great an anachronism now as an invocation of Apollo and the muses in a poem. Quid plura? I have condemned myself.

I am sure you have confessed to yourself that periodical writing is in truth inconsistent with the sort of studies I have pursued and with my slow and pacific habits of thought. I once imagined it would help to overcome my natural aversion to rapid and spider-like production. As to the use I might otherwise be to you I deceived myself from my ignorance of the real character of our public. In this respect no harm is done by my disappearance. As to contributions you would have been obliged to find others to make

up for my deficiencies, and as it is I will do what I can.

I am very anxious to hear from you that you are on reflection less discouraged than you professed yourself when I told you of my impending banishment, and that you see your way to proper and efficient assistants. Tell me before Friday what books I can send or bring from Aldenham. I need not quote Horace to you, I am sure: *Cœlum non animum mutant*, etc.

Letter XXVIII

Suggests some philosophers for Simpson to criticise—Their joint labour to cease for a while as he has to go abroad—The task of raising the level of thought is sufficient for a lifetime—Simpson the only Catholic capable of conducting a review like what "the *Rambler* strives to be"

Aldenham [*February* 4, 1859].

I bring Bentham, Todd, Raymundus. The latter reminds me of S. Augustine *de Trinitate*, in which I observe some speculative questions are discussed identical with those in your paper, which I gave to Newman. Proudhon will afford matter for a very interesting article. The chief American is Theodore Parker, of whom I have not read anything, and I believe he is fed from Germany. But a man after your own heart is John Stuart Mill. You would handle him capitally. Of Carlyle the most important things in good and evil are I think in *Past and Present; French Revolution* and *Latter Day Pamphlets*. Renan's *Etudes sur le Christianisme*, which I only know by report, would

be another excellent opportunity. He also stands on the shoulders of Germans, especially Strauss. Sir W. Hamilton is to appear this month. Shall you not forestall Meynell in dealing with him? Now you have done so many of these men, you could with effect take an opportunity of referring to the series and announcing its continuation.

Whilst I regret the interruption of our joint labour at least as much as you can, because I have derived more enjoyment and far greater benefit from it, I rejoice to think that it is only temporary and that it is brought about solely by external causes. The task of raising the level of thought and learning amongst us is arduous enough to employ us for all our lives. It is one in which approbation and popularity are no test of success, and in which success is necessarily slow; it is one too in which it is worth while to lose nothing by one's own fault.* You are the only English Catholic possessing the positive qualifications for conducting such a review as the *Rambler* strives to be. You only want a couple of dull fellows to take my place as advocate of the devil and to carp at everything you write. As for politics I leave you as my legacy the request that you will read Burke's speeches from 1790 to 1795. They are the law and the prophets.

* Dr Ward wrote in much this way to Simpson: "I think the *Rambler* has been the *only* publication which has shown the most distant perception as to the immense intellectual work incumbent on us in both theology and philosophy."

Letter XXIX

Montalembert is full of the *Rambler* and likens it to the *Correspondant* —Baron Eckstein will write a paper on Lamennais—Innocent XI wanted to make Arnauld a Cardinal, which is what the Pope wished to do for Lamennais according to Wiseman—Döllinger is pleased with progress in England

Munich, Sunday [*February* 13, 1859].

I found Montalembert full of the *Rambler*, especially the "bureaucratic article," * and highly recommending it to Cochin, who was there, as the English *Correspondant*. I gave him Moore's pamphlet and asked him to reply in the *Rambler*, which before Moore he did not undertake to do. He is anxious to to be more *en rapport* with us, deeming our cause nearly identical with his own, and asked a great deal after you. Eckstein will send you before the end of this month a paper in French on Lamennais,† and another on imperial politics. He hopes you will not care about inaccuracies of style and that you will improve it as much as you can in a free translation.

In the volume, *De vita et rebus gestis ven. servi Dei Innocentii XI Commentarius*, Romæ, 1776, is related how Innocent wanted to make Arnauld a cardinal. Can you not use this in your article, by way of justifying our Cardinal, who has not insulted the wisdom of the Holy See by believing in the intended elevation of Lamennais, since the same dignity was designed for

* Simpson's article in February, 1859.

† "Lamennais," printed in the *Rambler* for May, 1859, pp. 49-70.

the great Jansenist who had dedicated the second volume of his work *de la Perpetuité*, etc., to Innocent? I have extracted these passages from the above work. You will be able to make something of them, with a skilful hand, if you do not too openly disclose the purpose of the quotations. It is the first book I have opened since I arrived. I have taken up my old rooms at the Professor's, who rejoices greatly at what is going on in our island. I shall presently set to work on Austria, to explain the present condition and character of the Empire, since the revolution and Concordat: the rumours of war will add some present interest to the subject. I hear they can raise in a few weeks 800,000 men and have 50,000 ready at Vienna to send in four days to Milan. I encouraged Darnell to go to see you at Clapham.

Letter XXX

Will agree in anything Simpson settles as to Newman's editing the *Rambler*—Bishop Ullathorne actively encourages the plan—Döllinger thinks the disappearance of the *Rambler* would be an irreparable loss—Even with Newman as a contributor there would be a great gain—Want of spirituality is one of the most obvious deficiencies

Munich, March 8, 1859.

. . . . I am sure you did not doubt of my agreement with whatever you and Newman decided upon doing in order to meet the troubles which beset the *Rambler*. . . . I cannot give up all hope that Newman will be open to remonstrance. For the arrangement you mentioned at first (i.e., that Newman was to be editor) seemed to me full of

promise. This ought to weigh with Newman, that Bishop Ullathorne, his own bishop, actively encourages the plan. . . . Otherwise ruin threatens our whole press, seeing the failure of all attempts at reviving the *Dublin* and Newman's difficulty in quartering the *Atlantis*. . . . The abandonment of the first project would be a great misfortune now that the *Rambler* has lost its monthly continuity. At any rate I hope you will not give it up. The Professor, too, charges me to say that he would consider the disappearance of the *Rambler* an irreparable loss. . . .

At the worst, will not Newman even write for it? His contributions might do nearly as much as his ostensible editorship. . . I read your first letter to the Professor, who promised to give us a help if any subject should occur which would suit him to write upon. . . . The bi-monthly plan by enlarging the space facilitates the competition with the failing *Dublin*. . . . It was only from want of space that I did not use in the article on "The Catholic Press" an argument as this: The want of spirituality is one of the most obvious deficiencies which we must try and remedy.* But if pursued only by ascetic means, it will substitute a great danger for the deficiency removed, etc., and on this account severe and scientific study becomes more than ever necessary.

* In several letters Dr Ward urged this same view on Simpson.

Letter XXXI

Sends notes for Eckstein's article on Lamennais—Döllinger has put together what is known about papal denunciations of secret societies for Simpson—The news that Newman has consented to be editor is good—Sends material for a biographical note on Eckstein

Munich, April 1, 1859.

I have been hard at work preparing the notes I send you; as I could not help collecting by the way a good deal of matter besides, I have been longer at it than I expected I should be. I send them as they are written, on the understanding that you will adapt them to the purpose for which they were wanted, that you will select, translate, etc., as may prove necessary.* Some dates I have not been able to fix, as Lamennais' first article for the *Drapeau Blanc* and his visit to Guernsey, of which I find no account anywhere. Newman will want superintending in the matter of foreign tongues.

I send you also what I hope will be a satisfactory explanation of the denunciation of secret societies, which the Professor wrote with great alacrity.

Your letter is really a message of good news, and you will be rewarded for your forbearance.† . . . I have collected such quantities of materials about Austria that I do not know what to do with them. I will

* These notes of Acton on de Lamennais appeared as additions to Eckstein's article in the *Rambler* for May, 1859.

† i.e., Simpson's ready consent, although one of the proprietors of the *Rambler*, to make way for a new start under Newman.

work hard and send my paper by the middle of the month. I am curious to see what Newman will make of the provision for the March [*sic*] number. Newman's details seem to me very good, and at any rate they show the interest and determination with which he sets to work upon it. I have been writing all day, but will write to you more sensibly when Austria is done; also to Montalembert. As there are so many notes to his article, should you think it well to devote one, say at the beginning, to Eckstein himself?* The writer himself played a conspicuous part in the events which he describes. Of Danish origin, he was disgusted with the empty rationalism of the Lutherans, and came to Rome in 1807, where the spectacle of the treatment which the Pope received from the French decided his conversion. In the *Mémoires* of Guizot we find him in 1815 Commissary-General of the King of the Netherlands in Ghent. After the second Restoration he settled at Paris and became one of the foremost political writers of the Restoration. After he had conducted the *Drapeau Blanc* for some years he founded a literary review, *La Catholique*, 1826-1829, of which sixteen volumes appeared. In this review, written almost entirely by himself, though in a language of which he was never so perfect a master as of German, he advocated the alliance of science and religion far more effectually than de Maistre, for he exhibited a vast range of knowledge, including even Indian

* The suggestion was carried out, and the information contained in this letter as to the Baron Eckstein was embodied in a note prefixed to his article on de Lamennais in the *Rambler* for May, 1859, p. 49. He is there described as the author of the articles on M. Guizot in the October and November numbers.

learning. As a political writer he is better known in Germany than in France as the correspondent for above thirty years of the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the first of German newspapers.

Can you out of these materials make a slightly complimentary but a modest note on Eckstein, if you think it necessary? The real reason why he never obtained in France so high a reputation as de Maistre or Bonald was that he cannot write French well. I believe in the days of the *Catholique* he got Philarète Charles to translate his essays out of Ecksteinese into French.

What has become of the *Atlantis?*

Letter XXXII

A correction of a note on Eckstein's article—Attempt made by the French minister, Villèle, to secure the press—The introduction of the censorship of the press—Whilst writing has heard of the dissolution—Lord Granville wishes him to stand for Parliament

Munich, April 5, 1859.

I have a correction to send of my note on one of the most important questions relating to Eckstein's article.

Chateaubriand was dismissed on June 6, 1824. The editor of the *Journal des Débats* took his part, and, says Guizot (*Mémoires*, I, 208), asked Villèle to give Chateaubriand the Roman embassy. This was refused, and Bertin declared that he would go into opposition with his paper, for which the ablest writers, among others Chateaubriand and Fierée, wrote;

" *Les Débats* ont déjà renversé les ministères Decazes et Richelieu, ils sauront bien aussi renverser le ministère Villèle." This menace was fulfilled four years later, and so was the prophecy contained in Villèle's answer: " Vouz avez renversé les premiers en faisant du royalisme ; pour renverser le mien il vous faudra faire de la révolution."

Against this formidable enemy Villèle tried to make sure of the rest of the press that summer. The attempt to ruin hostile papers by vexatious legislation failed with the *Courrier Français*. Then he tried to buy them up. This was done with the religious and loyal papers, the *Gazette de France*, *Drapeau Blanc*, *Oriflamme*, *Journal de Paris*. Also the *Foudre* and the *Tablettes Universelles*, in which Thiers and Mignet were contributors. This made a sensation, and a similar attempt with the *Quotidienne* failed. It was then, August 15, 1824, that a censorship of the periodical press was introduced, which, as Louis XVIII died September 16, was rescinded at the accession of Charles. I *presume* that this measure of Villèle led to Eckstein's retirement from the *Drapeau Blanc*, for he started the *Catholique* shortly after.

Whilst writing this I have heard of the dissolution, and Lord Granville wants me to come and try my chance in Ireland. I fear I shall be obliged to try it, " pour acquit de conscience," and because an election is cheaper than being sheriff, but I do not feel sanguine. It would be very pleasant to see you again, but I am distressed about Austria, which I have not finished, as I spent a vast deal of time in collecting more material than I can work up in a hurry. I have

only done about six pages on the Josephine system, and hope to send off the rest on Monday.

Letter XXXIII

Urges Simpson to accept Montalembert's offer to write for the *Correspondant*—Is writing to Professor Höfler, of Prague, about Campion—Modern rescripts have no importance for researches on secret societies—Sends a list of such censures

Aldenham, Wednesday, April 20, 1859.

I have just received from Ireland your Munich letter. Montalembert is always rhetorical in his private letters, as Macaulay is always antithetical even in conversation. But his proposal is quite sincere. He has always tried to get competent writers in different countries, and from Germany he receives very valuable letters from Reichensperger, the leading Catholic statesman of Prussia. Your correspondence would be really valuable to them and to us, and you yourself, writing for an unaccustomed audience, would get a new light on many subjects. Only do not let it be merely an opening for ill humour and satire. You would spoil a good chance. I suppose it is from a misgiving of this kind that McMullen dissuades you. If I was you I would write, but with great self-control, and taking great care not to allow it to be known in England. I am quite sure that the secrecy of the thing would be a great security. It must be remembered that the *Correspondant* themselves are not immaculate in their view or perfect in their knowledge, especially of Catholic England. The weight of the

observations you will make in their recoil depends mainly upon the author remaining unknown. Consider this, I pray you, and that six confidants are equivalent to publicity at Charing Cross.

I will write straightway to Prague, to my friend Höfler, professor of history, about Campion. I do not see what consequence modern rescripts can have for your researches on secret societies, or how Newman can expect to find a law about them distinct from the Bulls in which they have been condemned. What he expects to find in the *Codex Theodosianus* I cannot divine. I find a list of all the censures starting from

Clement XII, April 18, 1738.
Benedict XIV, March 18, 1751.
Pius VII, Sept. 13, 1821 (Carbonari).
Leo XII, March 15, 1826 (Freemasons again).
Gregory XVI, Aug. 15, 1832 (in cond. Lamennais).
All these start from Clement XII.

Letter XXXIV

Is pleased with the literary garb in which Simpson has clothed Eckstein's "Lamennais"—Newman's projects as editor—He disclaims theology and does not approve of your writing for the *Correspondant*—In spite of his opinion I still think you should—Newman not well, but in great spirits about the *Rambler*

The Oratory [*Birmingham*], *Thursday night* [*April* 21, 1859].

I have read so much of Lamennais as is contained on the same sheet as my annotations,* and cer-

* The Baron Eckstein's article on de Lamennais in the *Rambler* for May, 1859, was accompanied by seven pages of "Historical Annotations" by Acton, pp. 70-77.

tainly Eckstein has never appeared to greater advantage than in the garb which you have bestowed upon him. I was horrified at finding my notes rendered conspicuously by large type. I was in time to make some corrections, but when I represented to Newman that the quotation about the bad pastorals of the French bishops * had been sent only for your private amusement, and maliciously forwarded by you, he insisted upon retaining it. Now I am proved to be more prudent than the serpent, I shall go about with a good conscience. I hear of a first part of the paper on Ireland, your Secret Societies (he is not quite comfortable about a reference to St Leo), and an article of his, editorial as it appears, on the Education question, but of this he has said no word to me. Besides which, Eckstein and your Gothic art, and a very elaborate summary of events. He looks to give great fulness and completeness to this portion. I am to send him Austria and short notices for July, when also he means to review Gillow, whom, as adapted to this penitential season, I read this evening. He disclaims theology, however, but took great pains to explain to me why he means to avoid criticisms of devotional books, a branch of literature in which you delight, and I looked as if I did not at all know whose books he meant. Strong in my consciousness of eminent prudence, I persist in thinking, in spite of Newman, that the opening in the *Correspondant* is not to be thrown away. There is so much to be done that I do really hope you will confute the criticisms and dissolve the doubts and objections of your friends, by doing earnestly and

* See p. 73.

carefully what if well done will be of no small service and of no little influence on public opinion abroad. I feel quite sure that Döllinger, who, not recognizing your hand, forwarded your letter unopened, will be of the same mind. I am certain that if he was assured that the effervescence of your conversation would not communicate itself to your ink, he would consider that nobody can give as just information and as discriminating judgements as you on things religious and secular in England. Such a league as Montalembert proposes would be of no small power.

Newman is not well, and his hand is getting so stiff that they are looking out for an amanuensis; but the change at his age will be very severe. I gather that he is in great spirits at having the *Rambler*, although he bitterly complains of his old age, and of the time he is going to devote to it. But he throws himself into it vigorously, and has large plans. . . . The Oratory has a more prosperous appearance than I have observed before. The school is beginning with great hopes indeed, but in a small way to start with. Caswall, the poet, as also the politician of the house, is full of the eloquence of Bright; but Newman talks of plumping for his friend Acland. He is just bringing out an excellent volume of his discourses and essays at the University.* In the one on medicine is a comparison of the warnings of conscience with the reflected scenes in the water in the finest style. I have only read that and one other yet.

* *Lectures and Essays on University Subjects*, published this year, 1859.

Letter XXXV

Difficulty of treating the subject of "Toleration"—Recommends a book by Thomassin on the subject—Contemplates writing an article himself on its historical aspect

London, Friday [*June* 17, 1859].

I am off to Aldenham to-morrow for a week or ten days. Let me know there what books you want. With regard to "Toleration," it will be difficult to treat theoretically without the fear of examples before your eyes. But there is a learned book by Thomassin in three volumes which I think I have got, containing the history and edicts of tolerance and persecution. But if you will do it philosophically and after your own fashion, I will try to follow up some day with a sketch of the history of Toleration. The reason why Plunket will not do as a perfect instance of political toleration is his violence on the Veto question. You will find a very angry speech of his against the Catholics on that occasion. Eckstein will want you to read him through again, for some matters of orthography of names and other hastiness. Do you think that his way of putting abrupt questions by way of transition and prelude to some episode, as: "What then is the Italian?" might be circumvented?

I gave Wilberforce yesterday the materials from the Blue Book, with some notes out of which he has made an article. I have written something on Des-

champs, but it is not gone yet,* for I wanted to write to Newman at the same time, and have been too busy. I had an interesting conversation with the Count de Paris yesterday, who is so amiable and sensible as far as I can see. Monsell has seized eagerly the suggestion about the *W*[*eekly*] *R*[*egister*].

Letter XXXVI

Desires to obtain F. de Buck's name as a writer to the *Rambler*—Articles from abroad must be rewritten

16, *Bruton Street*, *Tuesday* [*June* 28, 1859].

There is nothing to add that I can conceive to your letter to F. de Buck.† I see you do not think it possible to obtain the use of his name in the same way as we shall have Newman's. But any contribution, as a note or anything, signed by him would be invaluable.

I cannot help thinking that with the articles we receive from abroad a mere translation won't do, but we must *rewrite* them in English. This is clearly the case with German papers, and I think Eckstein's last paper will, if you revise it again, lose some of its peculiarities.

Newman says nothing is fit to be printed that has not been written twice over.

* In a subsequent letter Acton says: "Newman writes me word that the next *Rambler* is overcrowded with matter, and he cannot find room for the review of Deschamps which I sent him."

† One of the most learned of the Bollandist Fathers and constantly corresponding with Simpson.

Letter XXXVII

Is delighted with Simpson's translation of Eckstein's paper—Newman strongly advises the secularization of the *Rambler*—His criticism on Simpson's paper on "Whewell"—Acton's wish to find out what "episcopic work" Newman will do for the *Rambler*

Bruton Street, Thursday [*after July* 13, 1859].

I have read your elaborate translation through with care and delight.* It will be a good beginning to our next number. I have attempted a few corrections. If you glance through it once again you will not find much to do.

Newman strongly advises secularization, and says he would have secularized the next number himself. He will not go on with "Ancient Saints,"† and only half promises more of Ireland for next number.‡ Your voice from the tomb is truly very sonorous. If, as I hope, you are sitting down to hard work with Mill, you may like a hint of Newman's on your Whewell. "In that clever metaphysical paper, which you let me see, he seemed to me to begin with assumptions which he would not expect an opponent to grant him." I send this because Mill seems singularly well suited to give you a triumph worth gaining.

I had gotten so far when I received your note and inclosures. I will send on F. de Buck's letter to New-

* "The Political System of the Bonapartes," printed in the *Rambler* for September, 1859, pp. 298-332. Written by Eckstein.

† No. 1 printed in the May *Rambler*, pp. 90-98.

‡ "The Mission of the Isles of the North," in same number, pp. 1-22, and continued in the July number, pp. 170-186.

man in order to try him, and make sure of the episcopic work he will do for us. I fully agree with what you say of Newman's politics. The difficulty will be to introduce a new line on this point and on foreign affairs in a way that is not abrupt and uncivil to Newman. As he recommends your paper on "Parties,"* there can be no objection to making that, by a slight revision of the passages on Catholics, the opening of the breach on this question. A month or two's watching of continental affairs will make the operation on that side more easy.

Can we not have a nominal friend occupying that office [of editor] as a sinecure? You don't mind the work, and I think we had better keep all monies for other people's hands. As to the *name*, mine is not yet grateful either. Our security must lie in our own resolute prudence and in looking far enough ahead to overlook some of the obstructions nearer at hand that threaten to impede our vision.

Letter XXXVIII

Father de Buck's name can be used—Newman's continuation of his "Ancient Saints"—Newman is not well, but hopes to send some reviews besides the "Northern Isles"—Probable contents of the September number

Bruton Street, Tuesday [*July?* 1859].

Father de Buck's letter will be very satisfactory for September, as we can make use of his name to any extent.

* "The Theory of Party," printed in the *Rambler*, September 1859.

I wrote to Newman that he ought to give us two continuations for September—"Ancient Saints,"* because there ought not to be an interval of four months between continuations, and the "Isles of the North," because having appeared in two consecutive numbers there ought not to be an interruption now. I told him that this request was founded on external reasons, independent of the internal value of those articles. . . . I had a long theological talk with Lord Shaftesbury yesterday. We are very good friends.

London, August 10, 1859.

. . . . To-day Newman writes that he is not well, and cannot send us anything for the next number. He had promised a few reviews, besides the "Northern Isles." We run, therefore, rather short. I have given all my time to the current events, and have had so very little time, with morning sittings in Parliament—there were three or four days a week in which I could not write even a letter with comfort—that I have not done much for Austria. How, then, do we stand? Eckstein, 44 pp.; Current Events, say, with your help, 30;† Rosmini, 17—in all, 91 pp. Now, as to correspondence, we have only Father de Buck's letter, unless you wish your other two to appear, which will only excite anger. As to reviews, you have some. I can do a little French book. Then Maguire has been bothering me about his second edition of *Rome*, I suppose for a review. Did you review the first edition? I read

* Newman's "Ancient Saints" was continued in November, pp. 41-62; in July and in September, 1860.

† Acton contributed the thirty-six pages of "Contemporary Events" to this number.

the second, and sent him my criticisms, which he accepted very amiably. I could make a page about *Rome*, saying little of the book, if necessary. Then I can look up Deschamps again. . . . Will you look through "Parties"? If you have nothing else ready, we might put in Lingard and Lamennais, but not unaltered. Best would be if you have or could do a goodish article besides.* Only in case of utmost need, in case, that is, you have done nothing for the last two months, I could make up a short article on *Old* Austria under Joseph II and Metternich. . . .

Letter XXXIX

Has several pieces of information as to Austrian affairs from Lord Claremont, who was military attaché during the war—Begs that these extra facts be included in his "Contemporary Events"

Frognal, Footscray, S.E., Thursday, Aug. 18, 1859.

I met Claremont here, the English military attaché at the French headquarters in the Italian war, who told me several things that will complete our account of the peace, if you can work them in.

My numbers of the forces were from the Austrian official paper for theirs and from the *Patrie* for the allies. They may remain, but we should add the eye-witnesses compute the French force engaged at 110,000, the Sardinian at 40,000, and the Austrians at 133,000. But the Austrians left the bulk of their cavalry, 10,000 strong under Zedwitz, at Goito all day.

* Simpson did this and contributed the article "Captive Keepsake."

Fleury sent to Verona unexpectedly on the evening of the 6th with direct proposals for an armistice. The French expected an attack next morning, and turned out at three in the morning of the 7th. Fleury had found F. Joseph in bed. He got up and said he would give an answer next morning. Meantime he telegraphed to Berlin, as I have mentioned, and as they refused to answer positively he agreed to the armistice next morning, and Fleury brought the news to Napoleon about ten on the morning of the 7th. On the 8th it was signed between Vaillant and Hess. On the 9th came Cavour, and the Emperor wrote to F. Joseph proposing peace, as I have said. Prince Alexander of Hesse came on Sunday, the 10th, to manage the interview. Even then nobody in the French army thought of peace. At the interview at Villafranca Napoleon, after some ceremony, entered the house first, saying, " Vous êtes chez vous," thereby giving the officers present a hint about the fate of Venetia. On the evening of the 11th Prince Napoleon brought the preliminaries to Verona and got them signed. Then he had to take them to Victor Emmanuel at Monza, who disputed a long time, and signed in great disgust, Prince Napoleon being eager for peace.

Can you get these facts into our account?*

*Simpson included these facts in his "Contemporary Events"—"Concluding Events of the War," *Rambler*, September, 1859, pp. 409-411.

Letter XL

Newman has several short notices and a letter in defence of Napoleon —Difficulty of Roman Government since French occupation— Impossible for the Pope to recognize the right of his Chamber to refuse supplies

Saturday [*Aug.* 20, 1859].

Newman says that he has sent several short notices and a letter in defence of Napoleon* to the printers, with directions not to print until we tell them to do so. I write to them to get them printed.

Dolus, I know, *latet in generalibus*. The Roman system since the French occupation and reforms is no longer what it used and ought to be. This is their great difficulty, the discrepancy between their natural and their traditional policy and that which was imposed upon them after the Revolution. One cannot briefly explain the details of this. The absence of conscription is a remnant of the old system. Forced military service is, I should say, entirely incompatible with what I call the Catholic notion of the State. Yet that is the great source of trouble and contempt to the Roman government at the present day, that they have no soldiers of their own. But if we go, as you suggest, into detail, we shall find many things which date from the Napoleonic period, and apparently contradict my theory. All the plans of improvement are on the modern system and can only make the discrepancy greater. England for instance would have a

*This letter, headed "Napoleonism not impious," appeared in the *Rambler* for September, 1859, signed, "J. O."

constitution after our model. Well, it is impossible for the Pope to recognize the right of his Chamber to refuse supplies. To bring the general principles more home to the facts, an entirely new inquiry would be wanted equivalent to a review of About.

I have sent back your two articles. Newman says he has not had time to write to Wetherell.

Letter XLI

Hopes Simpson has corrected his "Contemporary Events" and has struck out anything unjust to Gladstone—Newman advises acceptance of an article by Arnold on Mill's "Liberty"—Sends a review of a book he read in the train going to Aldenham—Some passages from St Augustine on "Toleration"—Has lost faith in Gladstone—Newman is infatuated with Napoleon

Aldenham, Tuesday [*Aug.* 23, 1859].

I hope you have been at the pains of correcting what was corrigible in the last batch of papers I sent you,* and especially that you have not allowed anything unjust to Gladstone to pass. If you keep his speeches carefully in your eye, and remember the manner in which the people who knew him and liked him best—Hope, Manning, Badeley—speak of him now, you will understand the wrathfulness of my criticism.

Yesterday's and to-day's papers give great news from Modena, Florence and Vienna. Have you been in time to insert it at the right places?

Newman wants a proof of his contribution. I can

*The papers to be worked up for the section on "Contemporary Events" for the *Rambler*.

send him mine. He particularly wishes that the *letter* should not be known to be his, and perhaps made it look ill-tempered on purpose.

Arnold offered him a short review of Mill's *Liberty* so long ago as June, and he writes to advise that we should get him to write for us.

I am afraid the Emperor of Austria has done a foolish thing.

[*Aug.* 24, '59.]

I send you a notice of a book I read in the train coming down.* Although it is a German book, I have nothing else ready for review. I will get up in course of time something about Rome. It is wonderful how the mind expands and the memory fishes up all sorts of forgotten things when one gets among familiar books. So pray let me have the Roman question ; if printed, so much the more convenient.

I cannot find the passage I was thinking of in St Augustine about Toleration. But this may be of some use: "Si superbia non esset, non essent hæretici: hi autem, si non essent, multo pigrius veritas quæreretur" (*De Vera Religione*, c. xxv).

"Utamur hæreticis, non ut eorum approbemus errores, sed ut Catholicam disciplinam adversus eorum insidias asserentes, vigilantiores et cautiores simus, etiamsi eos ad salutem revocare non possumus." (*De Vera Rel.* cap. viii.)

Newman writes privately in defence of Napoleon, to whom I have sent answer. He wants the authorship of his letter, as I think I told you, kept secret.

* Schmidt Weissenfel's *Geschichte der Französischen Literatur*, 1859. Printed in *Rambler*, November, 1859, pp. 104-107.

I have marked the order of articles on foreign affairs on the copy I have returned, and I have sent Newman his part of the number to correct. . . I hope when I come back from Germany to have several longish articles done in November, December and January for winter and spring *Rambler*, if I can get three months of peace and retirement. I think, therefore, there would be no harm in getting a few odd contributors for the next numbers from people whose names will help with Longman. I am buying no books, so that I can afford to invest £30 or £40 in the attempt.

I have not lost all hope in Gladstone, but all faith and most of my charity. I have softened one expression.

Newman is infatuated about Napoleon. He knows no good of him and will not believe any harm. It is absurd to say what he does in the last sentence of his printed letter. He seems to go entirely by the analogy with Constantine, for whom indeed nobody has a good word, but of whom Newman has a worse opinion than I was prepared for.

Letter XLII

Preparations for the November *Rambler*—F. de Buck's antiquarian paper—Hopes Simpson's letter on the composition of the Catholic body will be carefully and "gently" done—Canon John Morris's Life of St Thomas should be reviewed

Aldenham, Sunday [*Aug.* 28, 1859].

I will try and find out what Newman will do for November. Northcote promises to review Palmer,* and writes a very kind letter. I have asked Arnold for Mill's *Liberty*† and O'Hagan for a paper on Irish affairs, and have no answer yet. Add to this your essay on Toleration‡ and a bit of martyrdom,§ and a paper from Wetherell, whose essay on the war‖ I have read since Newman attacked it, and fully agree with. The correspondence will include F. de Buck's antiquarian paper,¶ F. Weld on the Colonies, if you can get it, and your proposed letter on the composition of the Catholic body, which if carefully done, of which I am sure, and especially if gently done, of which let

* Dr Northcote wrote his review of Palmer in an article called "The Symbolism of the Catacombs," in the *Rambler* for November, 1859, pp. 1-17.

† The article appeared in November, pp. 62-73.

‡ The article on "Toleration" was withdrawn in deference to Newman's judgement. He thought it needed revision, and desired that his "St Chrysostom" should not appear if this revision was not carried out. As to the need of such revision he adds: "I ask of other writers only what I practise myself, for everything I write is revised by one or two priests."

§ Probably the letter, "The Cultus of the English Martyrs."

‖ "Thoughts on the Causes of the present War," in the *Rambler* for July, 1859, pp. 186-198.

¶ "External Devotion to Holy Men."

us say we feel equally sure, is a capital thought. Don't forget the converts in your enumeration, whom you omit in your letter. The Hungarian Diet had a maxim: "Vota sunt ponderanda, non numeranda."

It is a great question of tactics whether an attack ought to be anticipated or left to smite the air. The Austrian invasion of Piedmont is not in favour of the first method. . . Shall we have anything from de Buck on Anglican Orders? If only a review of Williams in a long-short notice. Morris's St Thomas* must in all fairness be reviewed. Shall we ask Allies, or does anybody occur to you?

By what masterpiece of a perverse ingenuity do you mean to introduce uneasy topics into your paper on Toleration? It would perchance check the perilous ardour of your pen if I brought fourteen moderate quartos on the subject to London.

Letter XLIII

Newman hopes to finish "The Isles" for November—Northcote has promised a review—He himself has much material for an Austrian article—Has been going every day for three weeks to a military hospital and getting information from the soldiers—Settlement of the Protestant question in Austria—Proposal as to the formation of a "Lingard Society"

Carlsbad, September 30 [1859].

. . . . I cannot tell for some time when I am likely to get away from Carlsbad. At any rate I must

* *Life and Martyrdom of St Thomas Becket*, which appeared this year, by Canon, better known in after years as the distinguished Jesuit Father, John Morris.

have a week with Döllinger, whom I have not yet seen, and I hope to be home before the 25th. Too late, however, to do any revision, unless for the name of the thing and the goodness of conscience you think it worth while to send me anything in type. Newman writes to me that he hopes to finish the *Isles*, but is not sure. Northcote* has promised a review of Palmer, Arnold one of Mill,† and O'Hagan an Irish article. . . . I have been to Vienna and Prague, and have seen great men, and have got much matter for my Austrian article and much I might have used for the last "Foreign Affairs." Since I came here I have also had a long talk with Count Buol. For three weeks I went every day to a hospital for wounded soldiers and heard a good deal, but I do not know whether I have anything that we can use, for I have read no newspapers. The dissatisfaction in Austria is enormous, the emperor discredited, the aristocratic generals in great hatred and contempt and unable to shew themselves at a café with other officers. Benedake, as the only successful general, and as a *bourgeois*, is boundlessly popular with the army. Not only is the army angry at having been led to defeat by incapable chiefs, but both army and people at the neglect of the comfort of the private soldiers in consequence of mismanagement and want of funds. This riles the common people fearfully. The army starved

* To Northcote at this time Acton wrote about his promised review, and added a word about his ideals in trying to continue the *Rambler:* "It is quite true that my new occupations make it hard work to carry on the *Rambler*, but when Newman gave it up it was inevitable that I should make the attempt. My principle is: peace among Catholics; for Protestants of good will a golden bridge; polemics to be directed chiefly against freethinkers."

† It is this article which Mr Herbert Paul calls Acton's "first contribution" to the *Rambler!*

in Italy, and the discipline was rigorously enforced on men dying of hunger and of thirst, which their officers would not allow them to slake. Then the wounded complain bitterly of the butcherly treatment in the great military hospitals. To a people accustomed to the thought of a "paternal" government all these sufferings are a source of extreme animosity. Politically the most remarkable facts are the inaction of Austria in Italy, where she seems now tolerably agreed with France, and the settlement of the Protestant question by the new ministry. The statute, of which you have seen and will, I suppose, give the chief provisions, is perfectly liberal and sensible. It has long been drawn up, and it is not Bach's fault that it was not soon published, so that his successor Goluchouski is decking himself with the feathers of the other. The Protestants had no real grievances, and this decree only secures to them the enjoyment of rights they, for the most part, practically possessed. They do not, therefore, exhibit any great delight, and there is no great practical change. But the row about Protestant oppression is silenced, and the cry against the Concordat is weakened. For this statute is conceived in the same spirit, drawn up on the same principle, and in fact completes the work of the Concordat. The Catholics have most cause to rejoice at it, for it concedes to the Protestants privileges, very harmless in themselves, but far greater than were granted to the Church. No Catholic teacher, for instance, can be appointed in a Protestant school. It was impossible to obtain a corresponding right for Catholic schools. This passage has indeed, amusingly enough been complained of on the plea that the

Catholics might now demand the same thing, though it was refused in the Concordat.

The Austrians are resolved not to interfere in Italy, and by refusing to recognize the new settlements, to reserve to themselves the power of upsetting it all when an opportunity offers.

China will give you an easy chapter. Eckstein writes full of admiration for your letters in the *Correspondant*. Shall we not begin again this winter to think of the Lingard Society? I have been putting together my notions and plans for carrying it out. Will you do the same and make a note of every *body*, *library* and *family* we may hope for materials from, besides those we can convoke as members, and the best practical way of obtaining subscribers.

Letter XLIV

The November *Rambler* shows that promises are sometimes delusive—Newman perhaps does not mean to send any more, but he had better be written to—The article on the Bonapartes has been praised—Projects for improving the reviews of books—Question of getting Longman as publisher—Three long postscripts upon Austrian and Prussian affairs, the state of parties, possible lines of settlement—Acton's opinion about the Catholic University for Ireland

Carlsbad, October 7, 1859.

I was delighted to receive your letter with so much good news. As to the November *Rambler* I must observe that promises are sometimes delusive, and that Newman's in particular are not to be trusted. His letter to me, half promising the end of the "Isles," was dated

September 6, long before he sent the "Ancient Saints," so that perhaps he means to send no more. I refreshed him with a reminder yesterday, but I am too far off to keep up the correspondence. Unless then O'Hagan and Arnold,* whom I requested to send their articles to Burns, have done so by the time this reaches you, Wetherell† or you had better write to Newman, as well as to the others, to know for certain. Letters will find them, 6 Harcourt Street, Dublin. At any rate, let us have the "Forms of Intuition" No. 1,‡ this time.

Passing from the next *Rambler* to the last, I am glad the treatment of Gladstone appears colourless.§ Our difference on important political questions with the midsummer Newman obliges us to be a little reserved at first. To make up for Father de Buck's criticism on Eckstein, Reichensperger, the Catholic leader in the Prussian Chamber, writes: "The article on the Bonapartes seems to me to betray a pen of the first order. May I be allowed to ask the name of the author?" Wallis has missed the point apparently of your essay "on Parties." A man may, without prejudice to his reputation for wisdom, dispute some of the opinions, but only a fool can overlook the ingenuity and felicity of the analysis of Toryism as a social not a political system. Reichensperger, above-praised, says he read it with great interest and agrees with the substance

* His article on "Mill" appeared in this number.

† Mr T. F. Wetherell, who had been induced by Newman to assist the *Rambler*, became sub-editor of the magazine at this time, with Acton as editor, and Simpson in the position, as he called it, "of a specially privileged contributor" and *locum tenens* of Acton.

‡ "Forms of Intuition" by Simpson appeared in the November number, 1859, pp. 18-41.

§ In the "Contemporary Events—Home Affairs."

of it, but says it is a question of practice, not of theory, and that no theory will suit both Prussia and England. Though this is simple enough, yet as he is a very able man, and as the Prussian Catholics certainly succeed better than we do in a very similar enterprise, I have begged him to put into a letter for the *Rambler* any observation your article may suggest to him.

As to the future *Rambler*, I shall not be back in time to make notes of the events of the month. But if you will help me in that, I will follow up on my return home, and will undertake the continuation of that irksome task. I am ready to do it not because my historical studies will make me do it well, but because doing it will help me to understand history generally. But it ought to be agreed between us that if there is any subject to be treated in the "Chronicle" which you or Wetherell happen to be particularly conversant with, you shall both make notes on such subjects that may be worked into the text. I am very glad you both agree with me about the importance of the literary notices. I have an idea which I communicated yesterday to Newman, that without excluding odd notices of various kinds, it might be a good plan to group together several books on one branch of literature in each number. I could do in this way ten pages of medieval history for January, and I could get, say, a set of notices of books on biblical learning, etc., for March, and so forth. This plan would, I conceive, serve to concentrate the interest of the short notices in each number, and, with proper assistance, would not be extremely difficult. This is the way, too, in which I could best bring my German studies and

correspondence to bear. I am beginning also to see quite clearly into the millstone of Austrian politics at the present change. I hope to have for January an article ready the tendency of which, as well as other things, your cool report of the Austrian princess will serve to explain. I hope, besides, to get one or two articles done before parliament meets, so as to have nothing but current events and literature on my hands during the session. I have had letters from Prague since my arrival here, in which Höfler, who, I think I told you, is one of the best German historians, offers essays on the history of the middle ages, naming subjects of the widest interest and importance. Another very considerable writer, Löwe, the same who discussed in a Vienna journal your essays on Shakespeare, proposes one or two papers on the English philosophers, I presume of the period between Bacon and Berkeley. I have asked for more exact information, and have accepted also. . . . After receiving your letter this afternoon I resolved to speak to Lord Granville about Longman. He promised at once to do what he could to facilitate matters, and said he would have Longman to dinner when we get home, if I liked, so we must bide our time and get Newman to write to Longman at the right moment. . . What you say about publishing your philosophical work à propos of the dicta of the Oscott bishops is well worthy of consideration, and meets half way something that has often occurred to me lately. It is not enough that the *Rambler* should recover its good name in the world separate from you. You ought to take the same opportunity of rehabilitating yourself independently of the *Rambler*. You

ought not to be known simply as Simpson of the *Rambler*, but as the author of such and such a book. Campion, if you could have finished him this winter, would have appeared to me the very thing. But the same will be done with your treatise of metaphysics. Mansel's remarkable success proves that a well-written book of this kind is not overlooked because merely of the subject. If it is not too long, if it is clear and helped with those pointed illustrations which come so readily to your pen, published by Longman, it will, in all likelihood, (materially) succeed. Still more, as you must seek a Protestant public, if it takes its place in existing discussions and controversies, if it hangs by sticking one peg into Whewell, another into Mill, another into Hamilton, Mansel, etc. On the other hand it will be an advantage to you among Cathólics that you can start from the recent utterance of the bishops and act as the pioneer amongst us in the great controversy which your essays have already engaged in and of which people are beginning to see the importance. I say all this frankly, believing your book to be written and that the getting it ready will not impede you in writing articles. Whilst I write, it occurs to me that if you confine your book to the cosmogony, there is not room for much that I have said. But then the interest of the subject is never dying, and my opinion is still the same. I would only impress upon you that you ought to do Mill for January. It is a capital subject for Longman, and it ought to be the least religious number of all. I suppose, in "Current events," you will give extracts from the Pastoral and sing a chorus to the passage you speak of. You ought sometimes to write

an article or a review for the *Weekly*. It would serve our purpose to sound an occasional echo in its pages. I have no room left to speak about the German confederation, and the projects of reform, but will, if I can, without delay. I read hardly any newspapers but loads of Austrian pamphlets.

I hope you have made some blunder about the catacombs. I met de Rossi, the underground archæologist *par excellence*, at Vienna, and renewed an old Roman acquaintance with him. He said Northcote had made some mistakes,* so I will send him the November *Rambler* and ask him to send us a critique or correction of errors, by which means we shall have him among our contributors. I have also written to Gratry for something which will give us the use of his name. The prospects of Longmanian advertisements and other advantages in the trade, joined to your account of our affairs and of your good understanding with Wetherell, is highly exhilarating. As soon as Palmer's book on Egypt appears, we must send it to Renouf.

I

P.S.—There ought to be a chapter in "Current Events" on the Established Church, of a page or two. Will you undertake it for the January number? Only a convert can do that sort of thing, and if well done would keep our friends of the Union, etc., on the look out. Pray consider whether it would not be well to have certain constant chapters in "Current Events,"

* No doubt in his article that appeared in November, "The Symbolism of the Catacombs."

as Catholic Affairs; Established Church; Parliament; Ireland, etc.; also whether any device can be better than *Seu vetus est verum diligo, sive novum.*

It is important to observe who are the friends and who are the enemies of Austria. This is the characteristic lesson of the late war and the most telling fact concerning the internal government of Austria. In Germany the people were almost entirely with her, the governments, when not carried away by popular feeling, generally against her. French imperialism has a great fascination for many of those small princes, and its influence has led them more than once to acts and wishes incompatible with the liberal institutions which subsist with more or less success all over Germany. Austria, it is often said, has lost friends by the Concordat. There is considerable truth in this. The old Austrian government before 1848 was the most unpopular throughout Germany, the very bugbear of liberal politicians and of the press. But the courts regarded it as their bulwark and their security. Every prince sought in it the safeguard of his power. Metternich was the Protector of the confederation which he had created as much as Napoleon was the Protector of the confederation of the Rhine. The mild absolutism and good-natured tyranny of the Emperor Francis was the ideal of many weak and timid sovereigns. Austria was the model of a monarchy, whilst France was a Republic scarcely disguised for decency's sake in the trappings of kingly government. But now it is no longer so. Austria has sacrificed in the Concordat the great and most indispensable element of despotism. The prince who does not command

the souls of his subjects has according to modern notions a very precarious authority over their bodies. It is Austria that is now the mongrel, half absolute, half free. It has surrendered to the most formidable and insinuating enemy; it has admitted a State within a State. Did not Dr Busby walk before the king when he visited his school for fear the boys should imagine that there was a greater personage in the world than the schoolmaster? And now that Francis Joseph has publicly acknowledged the rights of the Pope in matters hitherto belonging to the State, will not his subjects ask themselves whether perchance in other respects, too, the State has not hitherto overstepped the limits of its just authority? No State is safe from the influence of so pernicious an example. Even the old and world-wise Protestant King of Wurtemberg has been forced into similar concessions, and the Grand Duke of Baden has given way to the Archbishop of Freiburg as if he were a medieval prince living in dread of excommunication and the fear of God! There are many who make these speeches, and these are the enemies Austria has made by the Concordat. But that State, which was so long the object of abhorrence to the Germans as it is to the Italians now, has had with it during the late war not only the sympathy but the enthusiasm of the German people. Even the great majority of the Prussian Press had in spite of the Government turned by the beginning of April to the side of Austria. The two ablest political writers among the German democrats of 1848 were Gustav Diezel and Julius Fröbel. Diezel suffered a long imprisonment in Würtemberg. Before his death last year he had written

the most powerful and eloquent pamphlet in favour of Austria and in favour of the Concordat. One of these has been translated into English. Fröbel, after being condemned to death at Vienna, has enjoyed the incalculable advantage of several years' residence in the United States, a homœopathic cure for democracy. His recent pamphlet on the peace of Villa Franca is the ablest apology of Austria that has appeared. The failure of the Austrian arms has caused her to lose ground in Germany. But Prussia has lost more by unskilful diplomacy than Austria by her unsuccessful warfare. The Gotha party—that which labours for the Prussification of all Germany out of Austria—succeeded indeed in depriving Austria of the support of Germany, but has injured still more its own credit by its success. So long as Austria remains a great power, she can prevent Prussia from absorbing the rest of Germany. Even if Austria was as much weakened as in 1848, the smaller states would find a protector against Prussian ambition. On the other hand, no Austrian statesman has ever entertained for the emperor the ambitious designs of Prussia. A division of Germany between them is impossible, because they would never agree, and because it would be in the interest of the rest of Europe, as well as of the lesser States, to prevent it. Yet that the present constitution of the Diet is untenable is beyond a doubt. Nor is it doubtful that France and Russia are interested in preserving it, because it makes Germany powerless in Europe.

In their attempts at reform, the patriots of Germany have to overcome the opposition of powerful enemies

and their own divisions. It is extremely questionable whether any effectual change will be adopted. The following plan has been proposed. The lesser States, in order to be, *de facto* as well as *de jure*, severally equal in right to Austria and Prussia, must be collectively equal in power. There are in Germany materials for three great Powers instead of two as at present. The lesser States have a common character, similar institutions and common interests against the two great Powers; therefore every motive to unite together in a separate confederation. The federal government would not affect the home government of each State of the union more than at present is the case; the army would be a federal army, and the diplomatic relations would be conducted in the name of the union as a whole. The several States would surrender their separate armies and their separate relations with foreign States. This union would then join as a third member in another union of the three great German Powers. By such an arrangement as this the jealousy between Austria and Prussia would be removed, the confederation would lose that simply defensive and consequently impotent character attributed to it by Prince Gutchakoff and Count Walewski, and the strongest barrier would be set to French and Russian aggression.

II

Dear Simpson, I did not finish these scratchings in time for post yesterday. I do not know whether they are intelligible, or can be worked into your account of German affairs. At any rate, they cannot stand in any degree as they are. In using these stones you must not

leave one on the other. I do not believe anything will be really done. If Austria had been victorious, it might have been possible, but with overweening neighbours right and left, I see little chance. I have not considered how the plan of a narrower confederation would affect religion. As far as I now see, not at all. I have no books of reference, but if you have anything authentic to refer to, you ought to add that the diplomatic agents of this union would speak in the name of so many millions of people, and would be backed by an army of so many hundred thousand men. I suppose the population of Germany, barring Prussia and Austria, is something like 15,000,000, and the army near 300,000; but you must not say this without book. If you can find in a Gazetteer or anything the federal contingent of the several smaller States, you can compute their possible force in this way: Bavaria had this summer above 100,000 men under arms. If the federal contingent of Bavaria is 50,000—I think it is something like it—you may double that of all the States to find their real amount of military force.

As to the Irish bishops and their dodge, I cannot help thinking the position very difficult. They say: Separate altogether. The Whigs say: Mix both in national schools and godless colleges. Now mixed, or rather neutral, education for children is not so detestable in principle as in universities. The principle is not the same. The national schools may be improved, the books changed: the whole thing conducted *fairly:* then the absence of the cross, etc., will not be a reason to throw it over. But in higher studies the Whig principle is detestable on grounds, not of religion only,

Protestant or Catholic, but of science too. I can neither entirely oppose the bishops, nor entirely agree with them. What I want is not the destruction of the godless colleges, still less that they be converted and live, but that the [Catholic] university should have fair play and a chance of choking them.

III

Dear Simpson, here you have a third postscript. I find that the population of the smaller German states, barring Austria and Prussia, is 18,000,000, and the army it could set on foot at the rate of the Bavarian, which is above 100,000 to 4,500,000, would be 400,000 men. The whole population of Prussia is 15,500,000, of which 12,000,000 are German; of Austria, 38,000,000 or 39,000,000, of which 8,000,000 are German. I don't know whether I can make the federal question clearer. The weakness of the present confederation is not in the small states, but in the presence of great powers in it. Both Prussia and Austria have possessions not in the confederation; both have interests distinct from it. They cannot therefore devote themselves to a purely German policy, and the purely German interests of the remaining members of the Diet cannot prevail at Frankfort. This is what the late war teaches: The German patriots were for Austria, not for her sake, but for their own. They wished to represent all Germany as united, so that an attack on one German State would be resented by all. By this they have more to gain than Austria. The help of Austria is worth more to Germany than the help of Germany to Austria. If Prussia is attacked, all the confederation is indeed

bound to defend her. Austria must give her federal contingent of 95,000 men. This she will do, but certainly no more; whereas if it had been established that the integrity of her whole power—not only her federal territory—was the common cause of all Germany, she too would have thrown her whole weight into the scale, in case of an invasion of Rhenish Prussia—that is, not 95,000, but 400,000 men. The Confederation has never gone to war since it was formed. This was the first occasion, and now one of its members declared that, as a great Power, a member of the Pentarchy, it could not allow itself to be controlled by the majority in the Diet; that is, that it refused to obey the laws of the Confederation. This was not unnatural, and proves, not the wickedness of Prussia, but the defect of the whole institution. But what was wrong in the Prussian policy was the attempt to use the troubles of Austria to establish her own dictatorship in Germany, and the way in which they sought popularity by lecturing Austria upon her bad government, whilst admitting her right, forgetful of Seneca, who says: *Primum esse, tum philosophare.* In a word, the interests of Germany were sacrificed to those of the great States that belong to Germany. The object of reform is clearly enough indicated by this: to get rid of this dependence on the interests and policy of the two great members of the Confederation. If these great powers disagree, all Germany is the victim of their dissension; if they agree, all Germany must follow their behest. Reform signifies therefore emancipation.

Now in 1848 two projects principally divided the patriots who tried to use the favourable moment when

all things were in a state of change and transition to improve the constitution of Germany. One was called the Grossdeutsche, or greater German party, because they understood Germany to include Austria. It only obtained the character of a plan for change and reform when it understood all Austrian territories to belong to the Confederation. This would be equivalent to putting Germany, with its 34,000,000, into the pocket of Austria, with (then) 40,000,000 of inhabitants, and this was not the plan even of the Austrians (though mooted at one time feebly by Schwarzenberg —always condemned and ridiculed on *Austrian* grounds by Metternich). The other, Kleindeutsche, little German party, commonly called the party of Gotha, openly and consciously arrived at the unity of Germany under the Prussian crown by the total exclusion of Austria. This was then a definite and vigorous plan encouraged at one time by the Prussian Government, the ideal too of the mass of German Liberals. This party voted at Frankfort the imperial crown to the King of Prussia, and were laughed at for their pains. There was something in it, because (1) it gave unity to Germany, though at the price of the Austrian portions of the union; (2) it gave more than double power to Prussia, which can hold up its head among the five great Powers only by taking the lead of Germany; (3) it was a great victory of Protestantism; (4) it was a great creative act of the revolution, which party said, first united anyhow, then democratic, a single revolution, victory of the barricades in a single town would suffice to revolutionize all Germany when united, like France; but when they are many States there must be many

revolutions, none of them certain to succeed. The last element is the strongest in the Gothaism of the present day. Carl Vogt, the most ungodly demagogue of 1848, is its loudest champion. In all other ways it has lost ground greatly, *ut supra dict.*, since Prussia's unpatriotic conduct during the Italian war. This plan has more against it in the eyes of most men than there is to recommend it in the eyes of a few. (1) It is quite impracticable, because Austria will refuse, because the small States will refuse to be gobbled up, because neither France nor Russia will tolerate such an increase of Prussian territory; (2) it weakens and impoverishes Germany, by separating from it many rich territories belonging to it, and by casting off that Power which upholds the dominion of the German race over other inferior races. The first plan makes a Germany of 74,000,000 souls, the last a Germany of 34,000,000, and adds Austria to her enemies. This party was always foolish (though the mass of literary men in Germany belonged to it, Ranke and his school, etc.), and is now weak as well as foolish.

We have then these possibilities:

1. A league in which Austria and Prussia joined by virtue of their German provinces. This is now the fact, and this all wish to change, because the Diet is only the scene in which Austria and Prussia contend for the supremacy, and the little States are isolated, and not able to act for themselves or to influence the others.

2. A league to which all Austria should belong, the plan of Schwarzenberg and of some of the Grossdeutsche party. If really carried out it would nullify Prussia and Austricize all Germany.

3. A league from which Austria should be wholly excluded, the Kleindeutsch, or Gotha project, popular still in Prussia, promoted now chiefly by the lowest demagogues for revolutionary purposes. It would lead to the Prussification, Protestantizing (by removing the Austrian balance of religion) and revolutionizing of Germany.

4. A league from which both Austria and Prussia are excluded, of the lesser States among themselves, which should again join as a collective unit, in a league with the two other great Powers, itself a great Power (intellectually and martially—universities and 400,000 men and all the great federal fortresses). The more I think and write about it, the more this seems to me plausible. The Catholics in this union would be about in the same proportion as in Prussia, where they hold their own perfectly, that is, I imagine, about a third, five to seven million. Parity would be enforced in all States of the league, and by this the Church would gain, because there are little States where priests are not tolerated. The petty, malignant ill-treatment of the Church that occurs in odd corners, would become impossible by the extension of the scene, by an increased central authority, by a closer union with Catholic districts.

I am pursuing this idea with great pleasure and eagerness, not because I expect it to succeed, but to make sure that we are not advocating anything very absurd. I do not think it absurd, but pray consider it before you speak of it. I would not really advocate it or recommend it in the *Rambler*, but show up the bad present state, the hopelessness of the two great projects of 1848, and

then mention this as the progress which the movement of reform has made, showing its advantages. All other plans besides these four are simply revolutionary.

It is clear that with this arrangement Germany would have gone to war this summer in spite of Prussia, and that Lombardy would have been saved (as it *would* have been if Austria had no hopes from Germany, and had not kept an army of 130,000 men ready to march to the Rhine). On the other hand, if Prussia is in difficulties it would be a sure ally, and would neutralize the jealousy between Prussia and Austria. It is useless to give details of a plan of which the completion is so remote that an indistinct outline is all that can be discerned. Evidently there must be a college representing the union of Austria, Prussia and Germany, consisting perhaps of three princes, an archduke, a zollern and a German sovereign. These would change in so many years, and the triunion representing Germany in that triumvirate would also before the time, say, one, two, or three or so years, be president of the new Germanic confederation. Perhaps the four kings, Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg, Hanover, might take this office in turn. They would have a responsible federal ministry, and a federal parliament, with two chambers, one representing the confederate States, one the nation (as in America, which with Switzerland offers many points of analogy). The first chamber would be appointed by the several governments: the house of representatives would be elected by the parliaments of the several States (in all, of course, Prussia and Austria excluded). As I said, I do not think this likely to be soon carried out, but I think that everything that improved the present state of things

facilitates and leads to an ultimate settlement something like this.

I am afraid my letter is very confused and unintelligible. It has been written at intervals since last evening, and my ideas have only cleared up as I went along. On revision I see no mistake to correct. I am not sure of the number of German universities, or of the king under whom Busby flogged. Be sure if you use this at all to leave not a stone upon a stone.

Letter XLV

A word more on German affairs—A book to be consulted as to the story of King Lucius—Thinks that there should be sometimes a lighter article in the *Rambler*—Suggests to Simpson to write an article on "Bores" in the style of Charles Lamb, and gives some ideas on the subject

Carlsbad, October 13, 1859.

A great deal more occurs to me that would serve to throw light on the question of feudal reform in Germany, but it is too late, I suppose, to say much, and I have sent already more than you are likely to use. The Governments of the lesser States mostly desire a stronger central power than now resides in the Diet. For this purpose they must surrender some of the rights of sovereignty. This they cannot do to an authority which will be shared by others, by powers whose interests are not identical with their own. The union of the lesser States would differ from Prussia and Austria not only because it would include no great Power, but

because it would be exclusively German. This would be the great element of unity.

I have found the title of the book I could not remember about King Lucius, which it would be worth while to insert in the note to F. de Buck's letter.* Perhaps it might stand something like this: "We should be glad to see the question of King Lucius fully discussed by our learned correspondent. He must be aware of the grave reasons there are for doubting the story altogether. It would be especially interesting to have the matter treated with reference to Schöll: *De ecclesiasticæ Britonum, Scotorumque historiæ fontibus*, Berol. 1850."

I hope you have got some or all of the promised articles. It would be unpardonable of Newman not to continue the "Isles" after an interruption of four months.

As our ambition rises, our weight, I presume, will increase. It will be a great advantage if, like some of the quarterlies, which keep a jester, like kings of old, we separate our wit from our wisdom, and putting the former into a place by itself, avoid the danger of making a connexion in our serious articles. Your pen, as the French have it, *déborde quelquefois*, as you very well know. Why should there not be a special limbo for facetiæ too good to be altogether omitted and yet unfit for appearance in the midst of graver things? I do not mean that we ought to alter anything in our mode of treating serious subjects, but that there should be moreover an occasional article, promoting no very profound truths, but relieving the gravity of the rest.

* "The Cultus of the English Martyrs," which appeared in the November *Rambler*.

You see, in the matter of excessive gravity my own conscience is not at ease, and as you have been kindly accumulating upon my dilatory and parliamentary hands the office of annalist and of literary critic, I beg in return to suggest a special addition to your functions. Can you not get a rise out of Lamb for January? Thereby allow me to communicate a fruitful thought. Why not in the course of the article express surprise and regret that Lamb never wrote the natural history of bores,* as he has of poor relatives, of swine, etc., and then proceed to give the physiology of the Bore after his fashion, with your own ideas? Having impregnated yourself with his style, you would improve upon him in substance, and you might say a thing or two that would relieve your mind at the expense of your neighbour. Alfred Smith and others indeed have copied C. L. somewhat in the natural history of the "Gent," "the Flirt," etc., but I don't think they have done the "Bore." In *Loss and Gain* (p. 10, I think,) there are some good things about it. But there is neither the word, nor its equivalent, nor the idea in Germany, and, contrary to the usual rule in language, that is a great sign that the *thing* must be very common. Is there no Greek for a bore? It is not a classical idea. Socrates I take to have been a bore in the eyes of many whom he cross-questioned in the market-place. It belongs to a particular stage of civilization. People with very few ideas do not, I believe, find time pass slowly and are not bored by waiting; even so with beasts. A sense of boredom is a product of luxury, like the gout, and a real epicurean tries to escape

* Simpson took the suggestion, and an article called "A Plea for Bores," appeared in the *Rambler* for January, 1860.

both, not by avoiding bores only but by avoiding the sense of being bored. The Americans again do not understand what a bore is—another sign of its belonging to civilization. Their speeches are endless and pedantic, their conversation pompous and extravagant, their questions impertinent and importunate. Sidney Smith met Daniel Webster at dinner at Lord Ashburton's and found that he held forth greatly. On going away his criticism was: Too slow for our market. I hate the French, but they are seldom bores. The idea of *l'ennui* plays a greater part than *l'ennuyeux*. A Frenchman is empty and therefore gets sick of his own company, but he can make play with a neighbour, whoever he be, as he can make food out of nettles with a little salt and pepper. But then a Frenchman is good-humoured, and that requires a vent but sours by inaction, and he is vain and wants food for his vanity.

Can you, in a pleasant mood, adopt the notion? It would not be a bad dodge to give it, as a quotation from Lamb, of a passage not sufficiently known and applauded.

Is a bore sensitive of bores, and does he see a mote in his neighbour's eye when he has a beam in his own? Talkative old men will listen to talkative old men whom we should go to sleep at hearing. I almost think that the next calamity to that of being a bore, is a facility for being bored, and thinking people bores.

After speaking so much of bores I can hardly say

I am truly yours. . .

Letter XLVI

Is leaving for home—A Venetian report on England probably unpublished—Prospects of the January number of the *Rambler*—Question of signing correspondence discussed—Scheme for getting regular foreign letters—Statement that Charles I was a Catholic—The importance of avoiding anything likely to displease in the *Rambler*

Carlsbad, Saturday [*October?* 1859].

It is late in the evening and we go away to-morrow, therefore I answer your letter first of all without knowing whether I shall have time to-night to finish a couple of pages on Anderdon's *Seal of Confession*, which interested me because of St John Nepomucene, whose history I happen to know better than Anderdon, whose research has not extended beyond the Breviary. We travel slowly, and shall not be at Frankfort till Wednesday, at Cologne perhaps on Friday. There, or at Ghent, I may find whatever you send by return of post. My mother is still too ill for me to leave her, and we take the Carlsbad doctor with us. Be sure not to give Newman an opportunity of saying that the *Rambler* is apt to run riot if I am not at hand to urge timid counsels.

As to "Current Events" (I vote we so call them in January, though they are contemporary now), you increase your trouble by analysing documents instead of quoting; on the other hand, a document must be quoted entire if it is to be referred to, and I am guilty of excessive quotation, twenty-five columns,

I think, and Newman twenty in July. There were good things in your article on the three Cardinals, which I regretted should be lost. I hope you will save them if you yield on other points to Newman's adverse judgements. There *is* a *published* Venetian report of about the date you mention. I do not remember it exactly nor the writer's name. Don't publish if you are not sure. Those reports are often extant in many more or less correct copies. The originals are all at Venice; copies were kept in families of ambassadors, others were made for men going on Embassies. Thus they get multiplied. Ranke's peculiar knowledge and views of modern history are derived mostly from a set of those at Berlin. The cold-blooded acuteness of those Venetians singularly suits and attracts and often misleads him. But if you have reasons for believing it unpublished, print it by all means, as it is certainly curious.

January seems to prosper. I suppose I shall have Austria, current events and literary notices; O'Hagan, Wetherell, Intuition number two; Höfler's historical article, barring Eckstein, Newman and other chances; as to "Current Events," I must pray you or Wetherell to make cuttings for me for a week or two. If my mother is better when I get home, I must go to Munich for a week. I have not seen Döllinger, and he is clamorous. Only a few extracts and a few notes for the order and connexion of things. With the help of the weeklies and of the German papers I can make up the rest. Then, I pray you, undertake the established Church as your peculiar chapter, including the revivals, dissenters' movements, if any, etc. Wetherell will do a

chapter of a page on the defences of the country. Does Marshall, Stokes, Allies or anybody know all about the educational legislation of the Emperor of the French?

It is very curious and characteristic of the whole system, and would afford materials for a very interesting article. Is no friend of yours living in France who has occasion to follow all this? Giunchi is professor at Old Hall—S.T.P., indeed, and wanted to write against our Jansenism, on which occasion I induced you to join in snubbing him, and have regretted it ever since. Clearly correspondence cannot always be anonymous if it is admitted to such an extent as it now is. If anybody has to set us right about a mistake as to himself, for instance, his letter could not be put in the third person. Newman wanted communicated articles to be anonymous, but he put Eckstein's name and title in full. For the same reason, because of the *éclat* of a distinguished name, similar exceptions ought to be made in the correspondence. But this *reason* cannot be made the *rule*, and we must find some other. May foreigners, for instance, sign in full? It is not so absurd a rule as it looks. No foreigner will write whose name has not some eminence, and with Englishmen we can seldom gain anything by printing the name which we cannot get by whispering it, or by obvious initials. If you have doubts, one may put a note about the distinguished correspondent, a countryman of Rosmini, speaking in a matter with which he is peculiarly conversant, etc., and any other compliment you like. He is an Italian, sensitive therefore, and therefore "butterable." As he is very probably right, let us treat him with all respect. But the real

authority about Rosmini is to be found at the Rag in the person of that dashing dragoon, Bunbury. He went and sat ever so long at his feet on the Lago Maggiore. At any rate I do not think a formal division, i and ii, of anon. and signed letters would be advisable. By the same token I hope you will get a letter from Hecker. It is well worthy of consideration whether we should not have such a correspondence from foreign parts as you and Reichensperger carry on in the *Correspondant*. We could get letters from France—Eckstein, perhaps Montalembert, etc.—from Germany, Prussia, Vienna, from very competent hands. Could we manage an occasional good letter from Belgium, where you have more friends than I; from Italy, America, etc.? it would be a new feature not without merit. If this is done, we must see and get an inaugural communication or two for January. Consider this, I pray you, and whether so much organization will not overwork us, and whether this sort of correspondence may not occupy a part of the space and prominence destined by Newman for starting new questions. I am too far to correspond with him on the subject in time, but if we reprint his advertisement I conceive this is the point to be modified. We must also in so doing consider whether his prospectus will stand fire if we get hold of Longman, and, if not, whether it is well to bring it forward again now. I speak doubtfully only because the prospectus in question is not before me either in the body or in the spirit, not because I remember anything which would be really a difficulty. But that very passage about the utility of the corresponding department for the solution of doubts and

difficulties did give alarm to bishops and divines. Perhaps, therefore, we might make capital by a judicious alteration of that passage, of course with Newman's full consent. I cannot ask for it because I have not the passage to be modified, nor therefore the means of doing it. If you and Wetherell agree with what I have suggested, you can easily make the arrangement with Newman.

In Stapleton's *Life of Canning* there is a curious statement about a declaration by Charles I that he was a Catholic, purporting to have been copied at Rome, about which Canning questions the king. Do you know what it is, whether it is known, or whether it is worth writing to Theiner about? If you print a modified article on Lingard, etc., I hope you will take care that it shall not stand in the way of any advances of civility the Cardinal may be inclined to make to you. It is important that this November number, being the last of the year and of the volume, should not frighten away subscribers. If we carry a good body of subscribers into Longman's hands, then I think the *Rambler* is safe, and we may look forward to a prosperous undertaking. I read in the *Times* the rifle lecture, and mean to get one of my friend Whitworth's rifles. It will be good exercise during the winter, especially as W. is to have a practising ground on Lord Granville's farm near Hendon.

Letter XLVII

Wants Capes to write an article on the Code Napoléon—The politics of his own article on the Political System of the Popes are antiquated—Danger to the Church of making too much of the Temporal power

Bruton Street,
Tuesday night or rather Wednesday morning
[*Dec.* 7, 1859].

I should be extremely glad if Capes would do his letter on the Code Napoléon. I must suppose some knowledge of it which I cannot give in my article. Since I came home to-night I have refreshed my mind by reading over again *Napoléon III et l'Italie*. It is really feeble in thought and execution and exhibits no power of will.

I am afraid the politics of my article* are very old-fashioned. I have never come out so antiquatedly conservative, so Burkian, as here. I do not know whether you will agree with me. We must have firm ground under our feet. I remember you once said, alluding to my Austricism, that it won't do to stick to a sinking ship. I am afraid I am a partisan of sinking ships, and I know none more ostensibly sinking just now than St Peter's.

Why do we care for the Temporal power? The religious argument will not bear examination. It will raise up more enemies than friends.† We cannot absolutely

* Probably "The Political System of the Popes," which appeared in January, 1860.

† A letter on "The Temporal Power" was written by Acton in the same number, pp. 230-232.

identify an accident with the essence of the Church, and if all at once the Temporal power goes, one would look foolish. I don't think it will go yet, but if it does the injury to the Church will be great indeed, but the destruction of the States will be complete. *Ergo* I put the defence on the same grounds as the attack, both on religion and policy. I should defend the Temporal [power] both for the sake of the Church and of the States. But who has political instruction enough to comprehend this?

I had no doubt the writer was Jack Morris, and wrote to congratulate him; but I did not discover that he attributed the letter* to me, as he does the "Theory of Parties," which I like extremely, and as it has been so much attacked, I have an excuse for not denying that I wrote it.

* A letter called "Catholic Policy and the Temporal Power" in the previous number.

1860

Letter XLVIII

Difficulty about Acton's views as to "Temporal power"—Dr Northcote at Oscott—Newman much out of spirits—He approves Simpson's article on "The Forms of Intuition," but is convinced the *Rambler* would be ruined if the article on "Toleration" was to appear

Aldenham, Friday [? January, 1860].

Wetherell writes to say that he must give up his connexion with the *Rambler* because of some things I wrote in the last number. . .*

On Wednesday I was at Birmingham, Oscott and Edgbaston. They have tried to bone me for a great papal meeting in the Town Hall; but I saw neither the Bishop nor the resolutions.

Northcote will write a letter promising an article, and will revise Conroy's article.† He is very popular, and is engrossing power without as yet encountering

* Up to this time Mr Wetherell, having been engaged in War Office work for from twelve to sixteen hours daily for many months, had not seen much of Acton, and did not well understand his position about the Pope's Temporal power. In consequence of this, and of the obscurity of what he wrote in the January number, he understood him to be supporting the Temporal power to a degree to which he was not prepared to go with him. Wetherell consequently thought it best, as his official work left him no time for discussion, to withdraw from editorial responsibility. Explanations followed at once; and as it turned out that Acton had not meant what he was thought to have done, and that Acton and Wetherell were in substantial agreement on the subject, the latter withdrew his resignation.

† "The Church in the Ancient Symbols," which appeared March, 1860.

opposition. He finds, however, the reality worse than my description.

I never saw Newman so much out of spirits, so distributively angry. He likes the last *Rambler*. Other things greally trouble him, some of which he would not tell me and some he wished me not to repeat. Personally he was as usual extremely kind. He has no quarrel with "Intuition,"* but is convinced that we should be ruined if our "Toleration" were to appear.

Letter XLIX

Newman's feeling about the *Rambler*—He is most anxious that it should continue—Thinks it is calculated to do much good, and nobody as much as Simpson—The danger *de facto* is theology, which we must avoid—Newman's desire that theological subjects should be avoided in the *Rambler*—Every occasion of fresh complaints against the magazine to be avoided—Acton himself cannot do so much work for the *Rambler* now he is in Parliament

Aldenham, Sunday [*February* 11, 1860].

Newman's wrath is not directed against you or me. I am not sure that we understand exactly in the same way his feeling about the *Rambler*. He is extremely desirous that it should continue as it is, either two- or three-monthly, and if possible in Longman's hands, and rejoiced greatly, perhaps immoderately considering the facts, at the report on our circulation which he has obtained from Burns. He is deeply convinced that it can be an instrument to accomplish much good and that nobody can do so much towards it as yourself. On this account he deplores whatever

* Simpson's articles on "The Forms of Intuition" in November, 1859, and January, 1860.

impedes the attainment of this result, and in particular whatever diminishes your authority. Whatever approaches theology seems to him to produce this danger *ipso facto*, not from the badness of our theology, but because of the offence to pious ears. Our only security therefore, and the only means of inspiring confidence, is to avoid all such questions. He persists in thinking the article on "Toleration" theological, not in the subject but in the treatment.

For us all this is a question of prudence. He himself regards it as such, not as a question of principle. I have never heard him speak openly on affairs as in the bitterness of his spirit he spoke during the half-hour I was with him, and his language was—more vehement indeed—but in substance the same that I have been hearing and imbibing any time these nine years from Döllinger.

He agrees with us in principle, and the question is whether we disagree with him in policy. I do not think it is a personal question, and you seem to me to do him injustice in speaking of his treatment of us. As things are it is impossible for me to ask him to write or to take any ostensible part in the *Rambler*, and we must weigh his opinions in our own scales.

It seems absurd for me to take the prudent line, considering my insufficiently disguised contempt for every unscientific method of treating literary and political and ecclesiastical matters, but I have learnt from experience the uselessness of addressing people in a tone they do not understand and supposing knowledge which does not exist. A letter of Dalgairns and our conversation with that obscurantist Ward are por-

tentously instructive in this respect. It is difficult to accommodate oneself to a state of mind one can hardly understand, but I fully recognize the fact of its existence and the wisdom of acting accordingly.

If you agree with me in this, you have no objection to make to the only thing Newman wants us to do, to eschew absolutely the treatment of theological questions and the theological treatment of questions. The alternative is to fight, as Capes thinks you ought to have done last spring when I was abroad. Now Newman attempted to fight in defence of the laity,* and the consequence was that he was silenced, and that the circulation did not materially improve. Now since we have taken the *Rambler* back again, we have made no particular new enemies and have gained some friends. Can we not go on and prosper in this way?

As to our ostracism, we ought, I conceive, to consider it simply as a matter of interest. The most important thing is to avoid giving any occasion for complaint or apprehension. It is not, I imagine, to please Newman that you are in retirement, but for the interests of the review. Do you believe that things are changed in this respect since last July? Compared with this it is quite a secondary consideration whether the secession of Newman and Wetherell abolishes the understanding on which we undertook to carry on the *Rambler*. But a more important matter is my growing incompetency to accomplish even my present part in the work. I have lost the blessing of solitude which I possessed at first. I must attempt to

* In his article, "Of Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," in the *Rambler*, July 1859, pp. 198-230.

justify my election into Parliament, and committees have marked me already for their own. It is necessary for the *Rambler* and for my peace of mind that I should not be always an indispensable element in the conduct of the review. With the best will in the world, and the greatest disinclination to go to bed before four o'clock, I cannot go on without the comfortable assurance that in an emergency which may disable me for a time, a number can be brought out without overworking you. Independently therefore of the more familiar reasons, it is, I assure you, vitally important to get some other associate, and I will advance ten guineas a number, for the next three numbers, let us say, if you can get a man who will do two or three sheets a number for the money.

Letter L

Acknowledges Simpson's contribution to the next *Rambler* on "Catholic Affairs," which he corrects—Other papers have come to hand—Proposals as to assisting the *Weekly Register* by articles—Simpson's article on "The Theory of Party" much appreciated—Gladstone's political ability as against that of Lord John Russell and Palmerston

16 *Bruton Street, Tuesday night, Feb.* 21.

I send you Newman's letter, which I defer answering till you return it, after answering him yourself. Many thanks for "Catholic Affairs,"* which will save me much trouble, and which I have ventured to deprive of what might appear polemical, as our narrative ought, I conceive, to be as objective as possible.

* Printed in the March *Rambler*, pp. 399-401.

A certain sweep was proud of having been spoken to by a lord, who said, "D—— you, get out of my way." I have taken away from Mr Henessey and Mr Macmahon the opportunity of rejoicing at their appearance under similar circumstances in our pages. Bishop Ullathorne's speech was so full of inaccuracies, being at the same time entirely founded on the book I gave him, that I have taken leave to say so in a complimentary way, as a sort of set-off against your criticism.* Brownson's son goes to Paris to-morrow to become a Jesuit, after bestowing a good deal of his presence on me for a day or two. He thinks his father is very favourably disposed to us, and will like to send us letters. O'Hagan's article † arrived, and seems to me fully excellent. I put it No. 1. He wishes the authorship kept secret. I have got no proof but Conroy, which came to-day.‡ I have gone through it, and send it with this for your further corrections. De Buck's letter is very welcome, though clearly not meant for publication straightway. I'll ask Ffoulkes for his MS., but without any promise, for I know Badeley has translated some hymns literally, and I should like to compare them. I had a long conversation to-day with Macaulay, who is the *Weekly Register*. He says he wants it to be our organ (O'Ferrall's, Monsell's and myself), and to declare its political as well as its religious principles definitely. He wishes therefore to have our regular advice and directions. He says it is

* Ibid. p. 400.

† "The Hopes of Ireland," printed in the *Rambler* for March, 1860, pp. 281-291.

‡ The article on "The Church in the Ancient Symbols," in the same number.

paying very well; that he is going to push the connexion in Ireland, where he is helped by the new Solicitor General; that he wants me to find him writers. Let us try to get it up in Wilberforce's absence and in his despite. I will do certainly what I can with such a willing vessel, and you will lend, I hope, an occasional helping hand. I have stipulated for absence of controversy *among* Catholics, such as attacks on the *Tablet*, and other washing of dirty linen in public; breadth of political opinions, to be not founded on attachment to persons, but to principles, without therefore eternal quarrels with Lord John, etc. I have spoken to Monsell, and I think we are bound to make an attempt. I ought to say that you must have no misgivings about political writing, for the essay on "Party"* has had a great success in Ireland. Lord Granville has had letters from distant friends requesting him to forward congenial papers, etc., to the distinguished author, supposing him to be myself, and in various quarters I hear of the great impression that it made. If you will write an occasional leader, and let them have it through my hands at first, I will try to get as much from Stokes, O'Hagan and perhaps Ffoulkes. I really hope you can make up your mind to this; it is a means of power not to be lost. Macaulay is not a bad specimen of an Irishman, and seems to be blessed with several candid friends, whose remarks make an impression on him. The *Weekly Register* may become a useful auxiliary in our work.

To-morrow I eat orthodox fish with the Fullertons

* The article by Simpson in the September *Rambler*.

at two o'clock to make acquaintance with Feilding, from whom I shall hear more facts of the Birmingham meeting, though perhaps not more truth than from Newman, whose letter on that occasion was remarkably diplomatic. The enormous disproportion of ability between Lord John and Palma Vecchio * on one side, and Gladstone on the other, in these debates, will make it very difficult for them to prevent him from superseding them if he likes and plays his cards as well out of the House as in it.

Letter LI

Arrangements for the articles in the *Rambler* for May—Bishop Ullathorne has sent his thanks for correction of mistakes in his Birmingham speech

9 *Royal Crescent, Brighton,*
Tuesday, March 6.

I am very glad you promise a second article on Deschamps for this week, and hope there will be plenty of self-assertion in it, so as not to seem dependent for your wisdom on the author. Are you working at "Reform"? † If anything can be made of Eckstein,‡ we are well provided for next number, as Arnold promises an article, already nearly finished, on the "University,"§ besides his long paper on "Scott,"‖ of which we can put in as much or as little as we like. So there

* i.e., Lord Palmerston.

† The article was printed in the *Rambler*, May, 1860, pp. 11-26.

‡ This appeared in same number, pp. 68-83, under the title of "The Church and Science: I, The Exact Sciences."

§ "The Catholic University of Ireland," in the same, pp. 1-10.

‖ "Sir Walter Scott," printed in same number, pp. 39-67.

is: "Reform," Eckstein, Höfler on the "Roman States-system,"* Arnold on the "University"—all candidates for the first half; Conroy,† Arnold on "Scott," Meynell‡ for the second.

P.S.—I wrote to Ullathorne pointing out eight mistakes in his speech, and got a very friendly and handsome letter of thanks, saying that my corrections came in time for the *expensive* edition, being the only one Protestants are likely to see.

Letter LII

Simpson's portentous power of work—Articles for the next *Rambler*—Reform a normal growth in the State—Suggestions for a light article—Sketch for a paper on "The Philosopher's Stone," afterwards filled in by Simpson

Brighton, Friday, March 9.

You are a power and portent of labour and activity. I will do all I can in a supplementary way to help in foreign affairs, and I am very grateful for the load of trouble you shift from my shoulders to your own. For "Foreign Affairs" Rechberg's recent State-papers§ will require analysing. If war breaks out in Italy, the matter will be easily found.

I am very glad to hear of Owen's book,‖ which by

* "The Political System of the Popes," II, in the same, pp. 27-39. The greater part of this article, as well as of the previous one printed in January, was the work of Acton.

† "The Church in the Ancient Symbols," II, pp. 106-113.

‡ "The Limits of our Thought," in the same, pp. 83-106.

§ This was done pp. 130-144 of the May *Rambler*.

‖ Owen's *Palæontology: or, a Systematic Summary of Extinct Animals and their Geological Relations*, was reviewed in the *Rambler*, May 1860, pp. 127-128.

all means review. I have written abroad for correspondence. Arnold's "Scott" will, I suppose, be lightish reading, of which we may give as much as we like. His paper on the "University" (*pro domo*) was intended for the *Freeman*, which refused it, and then for a pamphlet. But he is inclined to take advantage of my mistake, and send it to us.* I suppose he wishes the authorship to be concealed, and I said that if there was nothing which would look like spitefulness on the part of Newman or his friends, it should be editorial. It is to be only seven or eight pages.

If you write on "Reform" for the *Weekly Register*, I suppose they will be obliged to see that you don't contradict what they have already said. With this condition it would be very good, and Monsell was so eager that you should be induced to write for it that he has no right to complain. For my part I am bound only by my vague utterance on reform in my election address. I cannot conceive a State in which reform should not be a normal condition of progress, that is, of existence. Growth need not be change; properly speaking, nothing is so fixed as the Church in some ways, and in others so developing. As to facts, I possess few. But read, I pray you, at least before finishing your article, Mackintosh's article in the *Edinbro'*, and his speech on reform in his works; Bagehot's article,† reprinted from the *National Review;* Mill's essay on reform, and Austen's essay.

I am too stupid and confused to have any illumina-

* It appeared as the first article in May.

† Walter Bagehot's *Essays on Parliamentary Reform*, printed in 1883, contained this article from the *National*.

tion about liars at this moment. If you cannot be light otherwise, read some light book and review it, if you have time. W. Holmes, *The Autocrat of the Breakfast-Table*, Strahan and Co., a cleverish American, might give you some opening.

I have sometimes thought a very amusing thing might be written, called "The Philosopher's Stone,"* showing how often practical results have been got by seekers of the unfindable, and how men have shot at crows and hit pigeons. Astrology the cradle of astronomy, alchemy of chemistry—how an opinion must be made absurd before it can be popular or pursued with success, every truth requires alloy—how the Reformation produced the reforming Council which people had looked for for 100 years without success before. Columbus sought the East Indies, and found the West. How this is providential, because men would not go so zealously after prosaic ends. Distinguish this truth from "crying for the moon," as O'Connell and Repeal, etc. Every period of history, every great invention, would give instances of "this sea-king who never existed." If you will pursue this and work it out, I think I can give you examples.

* This idea was worked out by Simpson in the *Rambler* for July, 1860, as an article, called "The Philosopher's Stone," pp. 223-233.

Letter LIII

Simpson's article on Napoleon—Newman's opinion of Arnold—Lacordaire is ignorant of history—Napoleon III and the Roman question—A motto for the cover of the *Rambler*

Paris, Friday [*March* 23, 1860].

The extracts from the Bonapartes are very remarkable. I hope you will work as many of them into a chapter of current events as possible.* All the first Napoleon says of religion gives a very low notion of his capacity. Many irreligious men have understood it practically much better than he. Bonald says, near the beginning of his *Pensées*, a book from which you might take several good notes: "Napoléon donnait des tableaux aux églises, des revenus aux évêques, des pensions aux marguilliers—il appelait cela rétablir la religion"—or something like this. It might be quoted in illustration of the quotations. I cannot find Beauterne. If he is at Munich, I will send you extracts. The passages about the preachers might give the canvas of an amusing little article, if there is nothing else. I find Newman is very fond of Arnold, and expects that one day he will settle at Edgbaston. If I have time, I will send you at least notes for a short notice of Morris' *Becket* from Munich and anything else that occurs to me.

Reichensperger promises a letter† on Roman Catho-

*Mr Simpson contributed an article on "The Ecclesiastical Policy of Louis Napoleon," containing this collection of extracts, to the May *Rambler*, pp. 115-19.

†This Catholic statesman had already had a long letter in the *Rambler* for January, 1860, pp. 237-243, urging that "the union of Catholics in

lic politics, though hardly for next time, and it must be rewritten and not signed by him, as he will have to omit his own exploits.

Perhaps I shall manage to send you a letter from Germany for correspondence. Gratry tells me that Lacordaire is unsettled. He is grossly ignorant of history; remember that if you review him or build on him.

I cannot sufficiently repeat that Bagehot wrote an article on Reform in the *National* last year, and published it separately.

I would observe on the Roman question, etc., that the crime of the Emperor is not so great, that he is not worse than the generality of the people through whom he is powerful, etc., as you say in the *Register*. But whereas Napoleon I, in his incapacity of understanding the real significancy of religion, saw the Church at her very lowest ebb, this man lives in a period of revival and ought to know better.

Will you call contemporary events *current* events, and put the motto on the title page of Vol. II and on the cover of each number of Vol. III—*Seu vetus verum sit, diligo, sive novum?* *

things non-essential" to religion was a mistaken policy, and that in those matters pertaining to politics combination should be left to "the free, combined efforts of all educated men." The letter was suggested by Mr Simpson's article on "The Theory of Party."

* This motto was afterwards printed on the cover, etc., of the *Rambler*.

Letter LIV

Newman approves the Russian letter and sends one of his own against X.Y.Z.—Northcote and de Buck on the analysis of the Catacomb phials of blood—Contents of the July *Rambler*

Thursday [*? April*, 1860].

Newman fully and I think highly approves of the Russian letter, so the printers have it. Also a letter from Newman, of which the authorship is secret, against X.Y.Z.* A clever and amusing but unjust performance.

I have already written to Northcote, ignorant of his opposition, saying that I earnestly hoped he would not object to the publication of your analysis. If de Buck is not quite positive, we must insist with Northcote, because it is a mere statement of facts and observations not an argument, and to suppress it on religious grounds contradicts all sense of morality and reverence of truth.

We stand about thus: Ninety-four pages, to which add Russia eleven pages, Newman two, Oakeley six, leaving thirty-one pages for current events, literary notices and your analysis. As to my article (National Defence) I only guess that it will be twelve pages.

* Mr H. N. Oxenham wrote to the *Rambler* under the signature X.Y.Z.

Letter LV

Contributions to the July *Rambler*—De Vere's congratulations on the magazine—Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* must be reviewed—Political science must be consistent with theology

House of Commons, Monday [*June*, 1860].

I went off to Aldenham on Saturday. I am sorry I missed you on Friday evening; I should have suggested some modification of the beginning of your lapidary article; the first page or two, I think, would be thought rather heavy. Pray what have we besides this and your martyr? Will Eckstein be safe and worth putting in?

Mrs Bastard offers a paper on Kingsley of which the summary is clear enough. De Vere congratulates us upon our improvement since Newman, but can do nothing now. I have received nothing yet from Gratry, but am almost sure I shall. I hope to manage several short notices, besides as much chronicle as you like. I have received Dalton's stupid translation of Hefele's *Ximenes*,* which claims some short notice. I dare say you will like to have the book. There is a Biblical Dictionary, edited by Dr Smith, of which I heard a great deal at Arthur Stanley's. I have asked Jack Morris for a review, and will get St John to correct it, and you will touch up both, but not for July. Can you write or get anything on some burning topic, and letters from De Buck?

Thesis: Political science must be consistent with

* An article on this appeared in the *Rambler* for July, 1860, pp. 158-170, written by Acton.

theology because of its moral foundation. It cannot yield like medical precepts, etc., to a higher law. Can you explain why this is so, if you believe it, as I do? I understand by political science the development of the maxim *suum cuique* in the relation of the State with other States, corporations and individuals. I find every one saying that the interests of religion must override the precepts of politics, which seems to me a contradiction.

On looking at Dalton I think he will give an opportunity for a short article on Spain, if I can manage it without books.

Letter LVI

An offer of an article on prisons and workhouses—In view of parliamentary action on this matter the *Rambler* should help, as it is a matter "of several thousand souls a year"—Cardinal Wiseman is dying

House of Commons, Friday [*June* 29, 1860].

Ryley has written to me about prisons and workhouses, urging me to write an article on the subject as I should do it *so* well, and adding: "I would offer my services, but I am too rough and too diffuse for your classical, etc., etc., pages." I have written at once to encourage him to send us an article on the subject for September,* and did not consult you about it only to save time, that he might not suppose that I had hesitated at all.

I hope you will agree with me. If there is to be

* It appeared in September, 1860, as "The Prison Discipline Act."

parliamentary action about it, we ought to help, and I suppose I shall have to speak on one subject or the other. You know that it is no petty grievance, but a matter of several thousand souls a year. We can submit the article to MacMullen. For my part I think there are as many external as internal reasons for accepting.

P.S.—It's all up with the Cardinal. Manning writes me that his resignation is admirable.

Letter LVII

Books, if reviewed at all, must be criticized on their merits—Robertson asked for a review—Wallis will notice it—Since Hardwick, Robertson is the best Church historian—Suggested additions to the review of Morris' *Life of St Thomas*—Plan of an article called "The Philosopher's Stone," with illustrations

House of Commons, Monday night [*June*, 1860.]

. . . If books are to be noticed at all, it must be done uprightly on their merits and with even scales. I sat down with the best resolution of speaking favourably of Robertson, who had begged for a notice, but I found so little good to say that I am afraid he will hardly be grateful and that we have not much assisted the sale of his book. However, I urged Wallis to notice it, who has an easier conscience, or a more shifting standard, and he said long ago that he was doing it. Robertson is clearly the best Church historian in England now that Hardwick is dead.

It is necessary to save our good name about Morris' book to allude to the fact that an elaborate German

life of St Thomas was published in 1843 by Buss of Freiburg, who has done it well enough. His book is fuller and more historical than either of the others. Then it must be noticed that the historical poem used and quoted from MS. by Morris has been since published. This *obiter*, to shew we are up to the events of the day. . . . The "Philosopher's Stone"* must be considered as ends not as means. Many instances to be given. Elixir sought in medicine led to many discoveries (I hope and believe). Was it not a man called Crosse in Devonshire who gave the impulse to the electric telegraph by trying to get life out of corruption? Then how necessary it is for people to have an ideal object which excites their energies beyond any material thing, though the ideal is never realized—luckily perhaps in general. Dismal is the state of nations like China, that is spurred on by no wish to realize an ideal. Then Mrs C. Hall has a pleasant Irish tale, where an old Irishman is represented "watching for the time, waiting for a good time coming, in perfect indolence and placid expectancy."

Is the notion of their impossible ideals got from a reminiscence of the primitive state and the original design of human life?—connexion with the millennium.

Neatly introduce the star of the three wise men, who followed it expecting to find a King, but recognized at once what they really found. Happy those who imitate them.

Ideals in politics are never realized, but the pursuit of them determines history. *Such* was papal diplomacy

* The article which appeared in the *Rambler*, July, 1860.

in the Middle Ages; the balance of power, all the attempts at universal empire which have broken down, but have carried things, ideas, institutions to places, like birds carry seeds where they were wanted by God's design—Persians, Alexander, Romans, Napoleon. Also political principles as a panacea—LIBERTY, nationality, equality, unity of weight and measure and language, socialism. Other similar utopias—Plato, Hesperides.

Geographical ideals discovered all over the world—Cathay; Eldorado; Spaniards go to America expecting to get gold, else those countries would never have got a Catholic civilization. Nations have had a star before them which they have followed in their migrations and which brought them to their allotted place, for all historically great nations *conquered* their homes. With the Teutonic race (and Aryan?) this was most the case. They had some mythological reason for going to Northern Europe, and then a similar impulse drove them South. Note Gray's lines on the southward course of Northern nations—Birds of passage:

> Where do they go to, and what ideal do they seek?
> What the Jews have before them!

All this is very crude and vain. It came into my head in the train coming up this evening. If I could think more seriously about it, or examine my memory, I would suggest other topics. I do not know whether all this will open a vein.

Letter LVIII

Dr Northcote's article on the Catacombs—The difference between the Lords and the Commons—Is aristocracy an element of progress in a State?—Haulleville's articles in the *Correspondant*

House of Commons, Thursday [*June?* 1860].

I am glad Northcote has been faithful to his promises.* I have a letter on Austrian affairs in time. What is Morris' letter you speak of? How in the world shall you reform the House of Lords!† The House of Commons is a representative body, and must change with the body it represents. It is essentially movable and growing, and adapting itself to altered circumstances. But the aristocracy does not represent, and has no real right to change, as its elements are constant. Whether or no aristocracy is an element of progress or of stability, properly, seems to me highly to be questioned. On all which there is much to be said; and I think I could return your MS. with some notes, if you deal with this side of the question.

I have had another letter from Haulleville, which seemed extremely sensible. I see also that he is a good scholar, from his articles in the *Correspondant* on German matters. He has also written a good book on Medieval Lombardy. He takes just our view of affairs in his letter, and criticizes Montalembert just as we should.

*Dr Northcote in the *Rambler* for January, 1860, had written an article, "On the Signs of Martyrdom in the Catacombs," which led to a considerable discussion. He contributed a second article on the same subject to the number for July, pp. 203-223.

† This refers probably to the article which appeared in the July number on "The House of Lords."

Letter LIX

The House of Lords not representative—The uses of nobility in a State —A *Saturday Reviewer* on Dalton's *Ximenes*

16 *Bruton Street*, Monday [June? 1860].

The only direction is that you really go too far at last in treating the Lords* as representatives. Lord Shelburne once said so in the Lords to Burke's indignation. Pray read in Burke's works the motion for an address on the speech from the throne. He says good things of aristocracy in the "Thoughts on the Present Discontents." If I was you, I would finish with a flourish about the uses of nobility in a State, its natural alliance with the priesthood, etc. But I should be afraid of making it a too *practical* proposal, or speaking as if you expected it could be realized. Arnold suggests that the *Rambler* should be pushed in Ireland, and thinks a good deal more might be done.

I was writing the most good-natured part of my article when I read the *Saturday* on Dalton. There is no concealing the fact that he is a great goose and has spoilt a good book. But the blunders of the flippant reviewer are so grand that I have asked Wallis to write himself a letter defending Dalton by showing up his reviewer, the only possible defence.

* In his article on "The House of Lords."

Letter LX

The *Rambler* should treat theory, the *Register* the practical application—The *Register* is the liberal organ, and the general Catholic public share most of its views—Newman speaks of the "foreign toryism" of the *Rambler*—Gladstone and Palmerston have been contradicting each other—Articles for the next number

16, *Bruton Street, Saturday* [*June*, 1860].

There is this much reason in what Hodges says that a weekly is not supposed to give general disquisitions not bearing on a particular event or question of practical policy. At the same time it was most proper to inaugurate a new régime with a general statement of views, and your article possessed the peculiar merits of a newspaper leader in the highest degree. Generally I think we ought to keep theory for the *Rambler*, and the practical application for the *Register*. Among other reasons for this: The *Register* is the liberal organ, definitely, and must keep its distance most clearly from the *Tablet*. Their rivalry will drive them as far apart as may be in their opposite lines. Macaulay is visibly an Irish liberal, and the general Catholic public is not very far from sharing most of his views. This will inevitably assert itself in the paper. Then Galitzin is a Russian prince and a Catholic of the Society of Falloux, *Correspondant* and Co., that is to say, in all probability a decided liberal, hating Austria next to Russia and Russia next to the devil. It is impossible to expect these elements to combine with what John Henry calls the foreign toryism of the *Rambler*. The dreary commonplaces of the enclosed

article do not regard you, as they relate to home topics only.

I failed to get young Throckmorton into the House on Thursday, but never heard of your being there. There was much poor speaking, but a triumphant performance by Disraeli, and yesterday a sound speech by Horsman, containing more things true than new.

I cannot imagine Gladstone remaining in the Government. He and Palma Vecchio* have been contradicting each other all through. I have been a good deal with him this week and have given him a paper on Mythology, which he asked me to write in support of his hobby about revelation preserved in it.

So far we have for the next number "Martyr," 29 pp.;† Arnold, end of niggers;‡ Mrs Bastard on "Kingsley;§ Riley on "Workhouses;‖ Eckstein, whom I have asked to write on Church and *States*; half a promise from Newman;¶ a promise from Wetherell; the "Philosophy" you have got;** another I will send you to look at; half a promise from Aubrey de Vere; de Buck on Russia; an Austrian letter I have already.

I will find out how many volumes have appeared of

* Lord Palmerston.

† "The Life and Martyrdom of Mr Richard White, Schoolmaster," in the July *Rambler*.

‡ "The Negro Race and its Destiny," by Thomas Arnold, in the same number, pp. 170-189.

§ The article on "Mr Kingsley" appeared only in the November number, pp. 66-80.

‖ This also only appeared in November, called "The Poor-Law Amendment Act," pp. 28-54.

¶ It was kept by the continuation of "The Ancient Saints," No. III, July *Rambler*, pp. 189-203.

** Simpson's article suggested by Acton, "The Philosopher's Stone," in same, pp. 223-233.

Montalembert's collected writings and send them to you if you would like to analyse the system of ideas that appears and varies in them. A vigorous analysis of his systems would be highly opportune. I could give some notes if you would do it as you did Bentham, etc. And would you undertake Veuillot's new collected volumes in November? The *Univers* ideas are a greater power in the Church than the *Correspondant's*. Pray reflect favourably hereon.

Letter LXI

Simpson's article on the "Philosopher's Stone"—He is sick of men who are afraid of a scandal—The articles, etc., for the July number—Suggestion that Simpson should become correspondent to the *Universel* as well as to the *Correspondant*—Metaphysical speculation of doubtful usefulness in the *Rambler*—A mistaken statement as to a question to Lord John in the House

Saturday, [*June?* 1860].

I send the "Philosopher's Stone"* to the printers with a note or two appended. Why did you not introduce Saul, who went out to look for his father's she-asses and found a kingdom? I am sick of the men who are afraid of a scandal. I do not know what you have written to Northcote, so I cannot write to him, but he must come to the very opposite conclusion from that of his letter, as it is now impossible to stop short, and the truth must be known.

What have we? "Philosopher's Stone,"* 10 pp., "Martyr,"† 25 pp., "Cardinal Ximenes and the Inquisi-

* Simpson's article written at Acton's suggestion appeared in the July number, 1860, pp. 223-233.

† "The Life and Martyrdom of Mr Richard White," ibid. p. 233.

tion,"* 10 or 12 pp.—about sixty pages. I will prolong the "Current Events" to 35 pp., and we may get ten pages of short notices, allowing for one or two of yours. Perhaps you will have a Belgian letter, besides Oxenham's. I send you a letter received this morning from Haulleville, editor of the *Universel*, of whom Reichensperger formerly and now again speaks most highly. Will you undertake this regular correspondence? By cultivating the *Universel* and the *Correspondant* at the same time you could do a great deal to keep ideas straight about our affairs. I do not answer him till I hear from you.

Do you agree with me that actual metaphysical speculation is of doubtful usefulness in the *Rambler?* I believe very few people read it, and that reviews of philosophical books or papers on the history of philosophy would serve our purpose better for the future.

The report of what I said to Lord John was so inaccurate that I have made Hodges put a correct one into to-day's *Register*, for the topic was so ticklish I could not afford to be misrepresented. Hodges answered that he could not trust himself to write a leader on so important a topic and hoped I would help him, so I sent him notes, which appears as an article, mingled with a few of the commonplaces of our weekly friend, so that I mean to conceal and can truthfully deny that I wrote it. The fun was that Bowyer, expecting something in his line, began cheering aloud at first, but pulled a very long face before I had done, and then got up to say that he respected my motives, but protested against the Government

* Acton's article, ibid. p. 158.

papers being considered of any weight at all. So I have hinted in the *Register* at the real meaning and aim of my question. I have no doubt we shall have some papers equally authentic and unfavourable.

I expect Dupanloup's book on Rome almost daily. I wish you would review it when it comes, and especially explain how much more no popery there is in the country than in the high places.

Letter LXII

Simpson's contributions to the *Register*—Lord Lyons' dispatches on the Papal States—The opposition to clerical government is the cause of disaffection, not against real wrongs—Papal government ready to make concessions—Garibaldi's decree against priests and in favour of confiscation of their property does not tally with freedom—Revolution the great enemy of reform—Antonelli's foolish wishes

House of Commons, Monday night [*July* 9, 1860].

The "Week" is capital.* Do go on and write with spirit. Hodge could hardly help putting your article where it did not belong, as he had no foreign article. I send you notes, which may help for a Roman article for this week, on Lyons' papers.† I got them and read them to-day. They are a running commentary on some of my articles, confirming, thank God, all I said. Monsell, Maguire, etc., are greatly disturbed by them. I think Lyons honest; Monsell doubts it from something he once told him, so it is best not to say so. I have sent for a copy to send you and will

* This refers to the work Mr Simpson was at this time doing in the *Weekly Register*.

† Mr, afterwards Lord, Lyons made the most valuable contribution to the understanding of the Roman question by a series of dispatches describing the condition of the Papal States between 1854 and 1857.

transfer my marks to it, which may save you time and give you materials to confirm these notes, which I have just written without having the papers before me. But don't speak decisively on the character or future of the Roman Government.

I have just seen Macaulay, who is delighted beyond all measure at your first article. The one he sent you was by Stokes.

Irish education threatens to be my maiden speech.

[*Notes enclosed in the above Letter*].

Lyons repeatedly recognises the good will of the Roman Government to make reforms, and also the determination of the people, of the discontented part of it, not to accept them. The opposition is not to definite grievances but to the Government altogether, not because it is bad, but because it is clerical, and therefore not suited to the spirit of the times. Therefore the disaffection in the Papal States is, like that in Tuscany against the Grand Duke, not like the Sicilian movement, a protest against real, distinct wrongs. The Grand Duke attacked because he was an Austrian, the Pope because he is a priest.

The readiness to concede very much on the one side, the resolution to be satisfied with nothing on the other, is the most striking result of these papers. Nothing can be conceived more criminal than the unwillingness to see reforms made which Lyons perceives among the malecontents, lest they should consolidate the Government.

Secularization will satisfy nobody, yet it is the great remedy dwelt upon by Lyons, because it is only a means, not an end. It is the means by which the

opposition hope to get power to alter all things according to their own particular designs.

These are eminently hostile to the Catholic system and not less to English ideas of liberty. See what Lyons enumerates as the peculiarities of Code Napoléon. In fact, Italian liberalism for the most part is not far removed from the system which finds its most natural expression and development in French Imperialism. Conscription, for instance, he himself says, is advocated by the liberal party, as it has been imposed on the Italians by Garibaldi, though it was one of their great liberties under Naples. Now conscription is not tolerated by a people that understands and loves freedom.

Then confiscation of Church property—he gives as one of the happy results hoped for—also destruction of nobility by abolishing entail, etc. Garibaldi's decrees against priests and confiscation of their property do not tally with that freedom which consists, as Fox says, "in the safe and sacred enjoyment of a man's property secured by laws defined and certain."

Lyons sets up a memorial to the infamy of Italian liberals, which they do not all of them deserve. But the first aspirations of the moderate and conservative among them, like the Marchese Carlo Berilacqua of Bologna, whom Lyons often mentions with praise, are baffled by their unscrupulous allies, who strive to make things worse under the present system in order that they may become better only by the supremacy of their own system. Revolution is the great enemy of reform: it makes a wise and just reform impossible.

Antonelli constantly speaks of a wish to reform in detail. There is little chance of this being possible. It

would excite more ill will among the adversaries of the Holy See than all the abuses. A people thirsting for the Piedmontese system can certainly not be conciliated by really good government.

See how little wisdom when in one year tariff was heightened and receipts, of course, fell—a year or two later tariff lowered and receipts naturally rose. What an empirical, foolish system! See again Antonelli's wish for conscription and other foolish notions.

Letter LXIII

Mr Wetherell's zeal in the work of the *Rambler*—The articles for the September number—A letter from Oakeley and another from Newman on education in seminaries—Newman's approval of the change in the *Register*

16, *Bruton Street, Tuesday* [*July* ?, 1860].

I am overjoyed at the zeal with which Wetherell sets to work. He had told me of Newman's answer, and is alarmed at de Buck's letter, warned by Newman's, and wants some precaution taken about it. I will send it to Newman with a letter of hearty thanks. I am just off to Robson's, the printer, to see what he has sent and to take the end of Ryley's article,* which is very much to the purpose and totally without personalities or declamation. I take also Oakeley's letter on X. Y. Z.† The Jesuits, whom I reminded yesterday, promise another. Newman also threatens one,‡ and the Vienna letter§ will go to print to-morrow—so that we shall have five letters from correspondents.

* On "The Prison Discipline Act," in *Rambler*, September, 1860.

† A letter on "Collegiate Education," in same number, pp. 401-408.

‡ Newman wrote over the signature "H. O." on "Seminaries of the Church" in the same number of the review, pp. 398-401.

§ A letter on "The Russian Church," ibid. pp. 388-398.

I have just sent you more blue books on Syria than you bargained for. Pray let me know whether you are seriously dealing with Dupanloup, besides spiritualism. Monsell and O'Ferrall have just been to Birmingham. Newman, knowing nothing about the new arrangement, burst forth in praise of the new *Weekly*,* and was told how it happened to be better. In particular he was delighted with your last article.

I have just been to the printers. They have got White,† Newman's "Ancient Saints,"‖ and Ryley's "Discipline"§—three articles; also one letter "from correspondents."

Letter LXIV

F. de Buck's politics are dangerous—A clerical policy may do for Belgium but not for England—The statesman Dedecker—All classes should have representation—Guizot excluded the upper classes in France

Saturday [*July*, 1860].

I begin by answering your letter before I read your article. You touch with the finger the point where we do not agree politically with F. de Buck. The *tiers parti* he complains of is not very different from that which the *Rambler* represents here, and is quite obviously the policy for a country like Belgium, where Catholicism and anti-Christianism are bound up in one bundle. A *clerical* policy (Mgr Malou and the Lou-

* The *Weekly Register*, for which Mr Simpson and others were now writing.

† "The Life and Martyrdom of Mr White," by Simpson, which appeared in the *Rambler*, September, 1860, pp. 366-388.

‡ No. IV, pp. 338-357.

§ "The Prison Discipline Act."

vain professors) would ruin Church and State if it prevailed there. And if I understand it rightly, it is due to the obstinacy of that party, dependent on the *Univers*, that a Catholic ministry has become an impossibility. The representative among Belgian public men of this syncreticism, Dedecker, is almost my ideal of a statesman. I don't mean in action, for I don't know enough about it, but in his theory, which if you care to know you will find in thirty quartos of the Brussels *Hansard*, which I have just received. An enemy said of Dedecker that he is a double-barrelled gun, one barrel to shoot at his enemies, the other at his friends. *Rambler*, *tout pur*.

I decidedly like your article, and am curious about the conclusion. I am afraid the view might easily be carried to excess. The upper classes, though the peers have no vote, ought to be represented in the Commons, just as the interests of the poorer classes that have no vote. *Classes* ought not to be excluded, as Guizot and his friends excluded them in France. This seems to me the merit of the Bill, that it will admit a portion of the working classes to the franchise, so that no common interest will be wholly excluded. It is very dangerous to draw the line of separation between the elements of the two Houses too strongly and clearly. The antagonism must be broken by the admission of an element of each in the other. In a note to page 3 you speak of Gentz as a Prussian statesman in 1839. He was a Prussian, but not a Prussian statesman, for he went early into Austrian service, and he was neither a Prussian nor an Austrian in 1839, but a dead man ever since '32 or '33.

Letter LXV

Newman advises that the report on the Examination of the Catacombs Ampullæ be not published—Father de Buck on "Rites"—Some Irish articles promised—The Catholic Charities Bill—The *Kreuzzeitung's* praise of the *Rambler*

Aldenham, Monday [*July?* 1860].

I read to Jack Morris part of the article about droll Druse, and he immediately exclaimed, "Simpson!" I begged for silence. Newman does not advise the publication of the account of the examination,* as he thinks it does not prove much. Northcote writes that he looks forward to publication when there are more instances. Newman says he will have no time for the last two numbers. Could you not induce F. de Buck to make his "Rites" into a communicated article next time? We want a learned article, and it will be beyond the limits of a letter. [Monsell]† promises an Irish article with the agreement that it is to be rejected if unfit, or corrected if defective. The Solicitor General ‡ has almost promised to undertake the series I proposed of historical articles on Ireland since Emancipation. He is to discuss the matter with his namesake the professor. I have asked Badeley for a short communication, editorial if possible, on the Catholic Charities Bill, which

* The examination made of certain ampullæ said to contain the blood of martyrs found in the Catacombs by de Rossi. The opinion that they were certain signs of martyrdom was challenged by the Bollandist Father de Buck, who suggested that a microscopic examination of the deposit would settle the question.

† Afterwards Lord Emly.

‡ Thomas O'Hagan, afterwards first Baron O'Hagan and Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

Bowyer got into such a scrape about. I brought Badeley down, but too late, although the Government said if they had known his points in time they would have accepted all we proposed.

There will also be an article in bad English, finishing the medieval pages, from Höfler. Aubrey de Vere offers poetry. Unless you think better of his poetry than his prose, I shall insist on the latter.

N.B.—The famous Protestant Prussian paper, the *Kreuzzeitung*, gives a very favourable notice of the *Rambler*, selecting the article on Scott* for particular praise.

Letter LXVI

Simpson's article on Lord Lyons—His views on the Roman question not so pronounced as Antonelli's—The Temporal Government has no future

Wednesday night [*July* 12, 1860].

I am very glad you have managed to make an article on Lyons,† now Lord Lyons, at Washington. They say his confidential conversation differs from his correspondence, which appears inspired by the English Government in the background. But I firmly believe that all he says is true. Antonelli says things worse than any he says, so I have no reason to misdoubt him. As to the Pope making all men equal before the law, etc., it is surely equivalent to doing away with the Temporal Power altogether, which has no sojourn in a

* This article by Arnold appeared in the May number, 1860.

† This appeared in the *Rambler*, November, 1860, in an article called "The Roman Question," a discussion of Bishop Dupanloup's recently published *Papal Sovereignty*, translated from the French.

world so altered. The inquiry seems to me nearly superfluous, as I cannot believe that the Temporal Government has any future before it.

Your style is attracting great attention in the *Weekly Register*.

Letter LXVII

The articles for the September *Rambler*—A letter of Newman and his article on "Ancient Saints," No. IV—Acton thinks the work good "and Newman exquisite"—Newman on the declaration of irresponsibility of editors for communicated articles as well as correspondence

Wednesday night [*August* 22, 1860].

As I must leave town with Lord Granville on Friday, I shall not be able to revise my article, which will be greatly needed. I pray you therefore, compassionately take it in hand. I added something to your "Tyrolese" and to your "Syria."* Can you get a page or two of short notices in case of need? We stand: Prisons, 17 pages;† Negroes, 5 pages;‡ Ancient Saints, 19;§ Spirit Rapping,‖ 8¼ pages; White, 23.¶ Add Russia,** 9½ pages; Newman, 2½;†† Oakeley, 7½;‡‡ Notices, 4; Events, 18. I send the Austrian letter, 3 pages. I shall

* In the "Current Events" of the September number.

† Riley's article "The Prison Discipline Act" in same, pp. 300-317.

‡ Thomas Arnold's "The Negro Race and its Destiny," in same, pp. 317-338.

§ Newman's "Ancient Saints," IV, in same, pp. 338-357.

‖ "The Spirit-Rappers," by Simpson, in same, pp. 357-366.

¶ "The Life and Martyrdom of Mr Richard White," by Simpson, in same, pp. 366-388.

** "The Russian Church," in same, pp. 388-398.

†† The letter signed "H. O." on "Seminaries of the Church," pp. 398-401.

‡‡ The letter signed "F" on "Collegiate Education," pp. 401-408.

write on Education in Ireland,* 2 pages, and this leaves 12 pages for my Defences,† of which I have written 7.

I am obliged to cut off many pages of Riley. The rest I think is good, and Newman is exquisite.

Friday.

I am just off. Newman writes that he thinks a declaration of irresponsibility should include communicated articles as well as correspondence, now that his original notice is omitted. Will you write it? I have withdrawn the one you prefixed to correspondence to make way for the other. Pray bestow some shape on my phantasy on "Volunteers."‡ It was written in one day and has no end.

I am afraid you will think I have poured a good deal of water into your wine in "Tyrol" and "Syria."

Letter LXVIII

Simpson's treatment of the "Roman Question" is excellent—Oxenham's dealing with Newman "is exquisite"—Preparations for the next number—He will contribute a longish notice of Döllinger's new book—Has got materials for a modern history of the Popes—Who will write on Montalembert's *Monks of the West?*

Munich [*November* 28, 1860].

I have been cut off all this time from all English news, and immersed in much private trouble, and I knew nothing of what was going on until this evening

* In "Current Events," in same, pp. 418-419.

† The first article in the September number, called "National Defence."

‡ This was the article on "National Defence."

the November *Rambler* came into my hands. I was sorely distressed at first on seeing that the men I had reckoned upon had failed you, but on reading the articles I saw that was no loss, and my conscience was greatly comforted. You have very courageously boarded the Roman question,* with only too much tenderness for Dupanloup, and I am afraid too many loose reminiscences of our conversations. X.Y.Z. is really a treasure of knowledge, temper and sense. I hope we shall get him to write often in the article department. His treatment of Newman is exquisite,† quoting him against himself so often that I cannot believe he does not know who H.O. is; but I fear Newman would be alarmed if his secret is divulged.

"Our most noble selves" seems to me too elegant and neither pointed enough nor allusive enough for you.‡ It is a very good letter in every way, and cannot offend any body but the miserable nameless scribe Meyer's Austrian letter§ comes late in the day, as it takes no notice of very important recent events. How do you stand for the next number? There ought to be a Höfler at Burns, and Monsell wrote to me that he was at work on Syria. Will you write to inquire? Address, Tervoe, Limerick. I have a letter of Morris's on colleges. I do not know what has been said in the papers and whether it is out of date. The beginning at

* "The Roman Question," by Simpson, was the first article in the number for November, pp. 1-28.

† Mr Oxenham, as X.Y.Z., replies on the Education Question, pp. 100-117.

‡ The letter was by Simpson on the danger of Catholics becoming a mutual admiration society.—Ibid. pp. 117-120.

§ A letter on "The Austrian Empire" was printed from L. von Meyer in this number, pp. 121-124.

any rate must be altered. He has left Aldenham. If there are attacks in the weeklies on X.Y.Z., it is certainly better not to notice them, at least by name. I have found a letter here from Wilberforce, who is full of your praises and says that you get on admirably together—greatly commending your article on the Austrian constitution, which I look forward to when I get home.

If you write by return of post, I shall get your letter here. Döllinger's book * has been out some weeks, and I can give you a longish notice of it—say 25 to 30 pages; otherwise I have not done much. I only came here a week or two ago, having been in Austria several weeks, in Switzerland, at Geneva and at Freiburg in Baden, where I made propaganda for the *Rambler*. Early in December I must be on the Rhine, and I shall be detained at Paris. Pray let me know therefore what I am to do for you. I thought I recognized Wetherell's measured head in home affairs and of course in Eliot's novels,† which I have never made up my mind to read. I have heard nothing of Monsell since September, when he asked for books on Syria, of which I sent him a long list. If you write to him, will you ask whether he cannot get anything out of the Solicitor General?

By the by Oxenham knows not what he says about forms of government in the Church. Your history is not always sound. Sebastian not Emmanuel was killed in Africa, and Granvelle was gone before Alba came, but what you say on clerics in times of revolution is none the worse for that.

* *Christenthum und Kirche in der Zeit der Gründlegung.*

† The article on George Eliot's novels was really written by Oxenham, not by Wetherell.

I look forward with horror to the beginning of the session and the solicitude of London and work in committees. I have got together materials on the modern history of the Popes and would give anything for a quiet half year among my books at Aldenham. Will nobody write a serious article on Montalembert's *Monks?* It might be proposed to Arnold. Will you sometimes think, when you have nothing else to do, and talk with MacMullen about gaols and poorhouses? I shall want your counsel in the matter.

Letter LXIX

Is at work on Döllinger's book for the January *Rambler*—Ward should be contented to be recognised by his three initial letters—We should be prepared to see the Pope leave Rome—It would do great good if he were to go to Germany—Döllinger's opinion—The support of the Pope—Peter's Pence, etc.—Inclines to a system of Papal domains—Urges Simpson to write some books—A society for the publication of materials for Catholic history in England most necessary

Munich, 6 December [1860].

Many thanks for your letter just received and for so much news. In several respects good news, I think. I have set to work on Döllinger,* but I shall be lengthy, grave and dull, near thirty pages I expect. I am afraid the Höfler and the X.Y.Z. controversy will not be enough to relieve my dullness. Ward has got three names, so without any classical joke I should think he would be at once recognized as a man of three (initial) letters. I don't think he has any right to protest or to insist that we should suspend

* For an article in the *Rambler* of January, 1861.

in his favour a rule to which everybody submits. Reichensperger's was a peculiar case, by no means establishing a precedent. Besides the weeklies can be instructed at once to name him as the distinguished or learned writer. Pray do not print Jack Morris without some corrections. I think the matter is grave enough to be pursued, and it brings so many fishes floundering into our net. You should have seen the Professor's countenance when I told him that H.O. was Newman. How has he got into such favour with Oakeley? . . . In the midst of so much ponderosity the Maori war or the "Remonstrance"* or both would be singularly timely. As to Peter's Pence I do not suppose Wetherell seriously believes in it. We must certainly be prepared to see the Pope leave Rome and take refuge in Spain or Germany. If in Germany (at Würzberg, where there is a splendid palace of the old prince, bishops and a faculty of theology, particularly Roman), the reaction upon German Protestantism will be immense. I had the luck to hear a long conversation on this point the other night between Döllinger and the ablest of the Bavarian Protestants. Their mutual confidence was astonishing to a beholder. Döllinger said that the thing at least was certain that the Romanism of the Church was destroyed for good, and the other was convinced that the presence of the Holy See in Germany, on the borderland of the two religions, must lead to the reunion of the German Protestants with the Church. But there are a great many more consequences connected with the fall of the Temporal

* This was an article by Simpson on Foster's *Grand Remonstrance*, which appeared in the January number.

Power, which when the time comes we must try to point out. In the March number I spoke of a possible combination of Peter's Pence, State payments and domains for the support of the Pope. The last seems to be the most natural and the only one that can permanently endure. Popular collections are uncertain, they cannot be equally levied in countries where the clergy is supported by the State and in countries where it is maintained by the people. Peter's Pence of old was a very partial and a very small tribute, and it was paid by countries where the Church was already richly endowed. You cannot expect a clergy that looks to collections for its own livelihood to be zealous in promoting constant and permanent tribute which enters into competition with its own. That applies chiefly to our country. But abroad there are more serious objections. In Prussia, for instance, the State cannot stand in the long run a perpetual or periodical popular excitement which combines the two things most feared, attachment to the papal authority and democracy, for in a bureaucratic State everything that stirs independently of Government, and in the mass of the people as such, that is not in their organization, is virtually democratic. Much more must those Catholic States which, like France and Sardinia, are responsible for the troubles and necessities of the Pope dislike and dread a movement constantly recurring, organized and kept alive by the whole clergy, which is in fact a protest against what they have done. All these difficulties will be met by the system of domains. The Governments, if they give up a fragment of crown lands to the Holy See, lose nothing,

because the voluntary contributions, which have the serious disadvantage *ut supra*, carry away as much wealth of the country, and it would be in each country a matter of little more than £20,000 or £30,000 a year. Add to this, which is a just claim and obviously in the interest of France, Italy, Austria, Spain, Prussia and Germany, to concede the liberty of private bequests, and the Pope is as rich once more as in the days of Gregory the Great. This I would hold fast to: that the arrangement that is to be made must be made for good. In speaking of the loss of the Roman States I could not speak of a chance of a restoration, for a restoration of the old régime and of the position of the Pope as a ruler of millions is, I am persuaded, out of the question. . . It is much to be prayed and hoped that you will keep up your spirits at the *Weekly*. There you are doing the service of outposts, and must be always exposed to a brush with the arch-enemy dullness. The good that men *write* lives after them, but it is only by patience and prolongation and perseverance that it is to be done at all with the pen. I hope we shall have patience and fortitude to go on sowing what we shall not reap, although that is a sort of labour which is not its own reward. But for you besides there are two things: one is to publish, if it can be managed, one or two books, trying Longman, Parker, Bentley and Hurst. The other, which your book on Campion gives you a right to, is to lead and manage the society for the publication of materials for Catholic History in England. Whenever I think of it, it seems to me more and more desirable and feasible. If I could only get turned out of Parliament in an

honest way and settle down among my books, I should soon bring to maturity my part of the plan. As you are versed in the matter, it would be important by degrees to collect an accurate list of all the documents, reports, letters, etc., that have been printed relating in any way to the matter. If you make a list of what has been published, I will make one of what might be. Really this is a serious matter, and we might do good service in it.

Letter LXX

Acton's article on Döllinger—Asks Simpson to read and correct, and to verify some quotations

Munich, Wednesday [*December*, 1860].

I send you the beginning and the end of my article.* I go to the Rhine to-morrow and will there finish the intermediate part, which will not be above four pages of print at the outside, so I reckon there will be altogether near thirty pages. Pray bestow a careful perusal on what has been, especially in the second part, hastily written, though it is on a subject I have read most of the books upon. It was difficult to put an account of the critical school in a moderate compass. I thought it wiser not to talk much about Döllinger's book, but by the help of other things to put it on a proper pedestal. Some malice will not escape you. Are the lectures on the Protestant tradition in the *Anglican Difficulties* or in the *Present Position of Catholics?* I have neither at hand. At page 19 I quote

* "Döllinger's History of Christianity," the first article in the *Rambler* for January, 1861.

a passage from Petavius, which both in the original and in Kulm's quotation finishes with *debeat*. I suppose it ought to be *præbeat*, but I know not. It is in the second cap. of the preface to *De Trinitate*. If I have put too strongly the Protestant disbelief in miracles (p. 7 of the last part), pray see to it. I say once or twice that I speak of rationalistic Protestantism, but not introducing that qualification each time may make it seem too sweeping.

I have seen some *Tablets* with very absurd letters. Walker has found out editions of Hallam's *Constitutional History* in nine volumes, and of Mignot's *Revolution* in twenty-four, which is about as long as three *Ramblers*. Northcote must be ashamed to be quoted for such bibliographical curiosities. It is rather curious that a year ago I wrote to Northcote a letter on students and divines at Oscott, compared to which X.Y.Z. is a panegyrist, and in February Northcote told me that really things were a good deal worse than I described.

A German says a good thing which you may apply to our friend Napoleon: "When the sense of right and respect for law is undermined, the *droit du plus fort* prevails. But the *plus fort* is generally up to a certain point he who is most unscrupulous in the choice of means."

I am just going to see young Wilberforce, the son of the late archdeacon, who has got an American wife with an estate full of slaves.

Letter LXXI

Acton's article on Döllinger—The question of Hungary—Schmerling's plan for the reconstitution of Austria-Hungary—The Concordat is threatened, and half of it secured will be better than the present "unsafe and unsecured"

Herrnsheim Worms, December 20 [1860].

I have shortened the article and omit several pages of MS. in which I went into details, as it would have led me too far. I speak of coming back to them: this refers to Döllinger's interpretation of πορνεία and divorce, which will be valuable for the Protestants and seems to me very successful. I remember the *Christian Remembrancer* of July, at the end of the article on Broglie, says of the kings of thought, as he calls them, in Germany that they write less well than the French, and his examples are Göthe, Kant, Möhler and the Professor. Now Göthe writes about as well as Plato, so the thing is absurd with these examples, but it is remarkable that a Protestant Oxford man should select these four as the greatest Germans. I did not think of it where I say that the book is well and popularly written, which it is in the highest degree alone of D.'s writings, or I would have quoted the *Remembrancer* to give *relief* to my sentiments. The quotation would serve also to praise Döllinger, which I have tried to avoid. Can you get the number? If so, it may be worth while to put it skilfully in.

I still despond about Schmerling, though I do not know his plans. If he makes non-Hungary one State and parliament and Hungary another, his house is divi-

ded against itself. I saw at Freiburg a long article going to the *Universel* on the subject. Some facts are true in it, but do not trust the judgements. The late plan of triennial parliament was Rechberg's. Its absurdity lies in many things; also in making so many small provincial estates over against big Hungary. Schmerling, as a German, was a national necessity, because Gotschousky is a Slavonian, and the Rechberg constitution made the Germans jealous of the Slavonic element. I have seen many more men who knew Schmerling. All think highly of his ability, courage and *finesse*. Do not publish this, but it is significant of Machiavellic genius. At Frankfort he, the Austrian, member for Vienna, confidential minister of Archduke John, wanted to let the crown of Germany be given to Frederick William, judging that Austria would then become chief of the popular party in the empire and would be strengthened by all the popular elements. He told this confidentially to another deputy at Frankfort whom I have just seen.

N.B.—If Archduke Stephen is spoken of in the paper (I do not see them), he was Palatine and fell into unpopularity on one side and disgrace on the other in '48; but he is the cleverest archduke, and I have just seen a confidential letter from him, full of confidence in the result of things in Hungary. His correspondent told me he thought he would be consulted or put into some great office.

The army is not discouraged, as I thought my cousin was, but eager to fight and confident of victory, as I hear on good authority. As to the Concordat, it is likely S[chmerling] will try and alter. I am more and

more convinced of that from what I hear. Half the Concordat, executed and secured by other liberties, will be better than the present document unsafe and unperformed. But the breach of faith will be terrible. Benedek is disliked at court, because the army forced him on the Emperor. People speak of Wallenstein. As long as Archduke Albert serves peaceably under him, good terms will certainly be kept up.

1861

Letter LXXII

Is averse to a communicated article on the Education Question—Does not wish the *Rambler* to adopt the views of X.Y.Z.—Newman is pleased with the answer X.Y.Z. made to him and is believed by many to be the author of Simpson's letter in the *Register*

Buckland, Saturday [*January* 12, 1861].

I do not feel certain that the termination [of the controversy on the letter of X.Y.Z.] will be attained by a communicated article. The pensive public is not metaphysical enough to understand or honest enough to be willing to understand the difference between a letter and a communicated article with respect to its authority and responsibility. By making a letter a communicated article we do not put an end to controversy, as we would tolerate not only a letter against a communicated article, but successive communicated articles contradicting in some degree each other. The synthetical, epicritical view which we might put under "Communicated" would not be elevated above the region in which Ward and Oakeley wage their war, or have the weight of an editorial decision. We have shared the odium of opening the question, as it is, justly and rightly. It will not be increased by putting in an article adopting some of the chief points of X.Y.Z., as we can separate ourselves from him properly on some others.

Besides, the outraged interests and prejudices have had their say, and the violence of the storm has abated in the public mind. Moreover, the belief will not be that X.Y.Z. has gained any victory in public opinion. Great names have appeared against him and loud voices have cried out. I think his general view requires and deserves support, and we give him that much more by a discriminating editorial than by letting the dispute go on or transferring it to the second compartment. Those are the reasons which make me think it would be wisest to finish with an editorial.

Newman I hear is pleased with X.Y.Z.'s answer to him, and is believed by many persons to be the author of your letter in the *Register*. He is highly pleased with the new number. Northcote and Meynell are both indignant with my article. . . I hear Newman has been so angry at various times with my politics that I am tempted to write an article on Italian affairs, which will cost less trouble than one on Baden, which would be more of fact and less of doctrine.

Letter LXXIII

General approval of the January *Rambler*—Criticisms on Simpson's "Campion," the first number of which appeared in the magazine—Importance of references—Certain mistakes pointed out

16 *Bruton Street*, *Saturday* [*January*, 1861].

I have just got the *Rambler* and read my abominations. Your paper on Foster* touches a great question capitally, and I have read with the greatest

*"The Grand Remonstrance" in the January number, pp. 176-183.

interest the beginning of your life of Campion.* Here are the things that occurred to me reading it. You must make up your mind from the first whether you are writing for a general public and for your present readers, or a book that is to satisfy the curiosity of learned men on the subject in time to come. I pray you choose the latter. It includes the former and will cost you no greater trouble, for you have the materials, and know more about it than any man living.

But then some things must be changed: 1. You must omit allusions to matters of merely momentary, passing interest, making them, if at all, in the most ingenious, secure, concealed manner. Nothing betrays more than this the low estimate an author has of his own purpose and of the capacity of his readers. Such are (p. 224) the points at Wiseman and Flanagan, which are really beneath the dignity and respect of history.

2. You must give references to your authorities whenever you do not quote common books either at the foot of the pages or in notes at the end of the volume, with numbers at the margin. In which notes you can then sometimes, and with greater freedom if they are at the end, give important passages in Latin, of which you have given the sense in the text. In all decisive points this is indispensable to give authority to your book; especially when you use unpublished matter. So also (p. 227) the quotations from S. Thomas and (234) St Hilary should have *Cap.* and *v.* There ahould be authority cited for the passage on Dudley's religion, half-way down p. 227, etc.

Then p. 217. Is "spout his address" dignified

* "Edmund Campion," No. I, in the same number.

enough ? Macaulay would have used it, but he would have covered and surrounded it with great splendour and pomp of words, and he is accused of vulgarity in his expressions.

P. 220. For Ingol*d*stadt read Ingolstadt, no *d*.

P. 221. Is it fair to Anglicans to divide them as you do in the sixth line ? Then in same I never heard of a bishop of Tarra*s*ona, surely *Tarraconensis*. Also has Demosthenes, in a garbled quotation, any business here ?

P. 226. Is Prince Consort a title naturally given to the Queen's husband ? I thought it was a privilege not always conferred, but I don't know. You call oratorical see-saw a passage which in Latin must read very like certain passages of Cicero, for which there is certainly a learned rhetorical designation.

P. 232. " Governor " in inverted commas means father. It is a natural old word for tutor, and you so use it farther on.

P. 233. Cardinal Toleto, generally Toletus ; but I suppose you have authority.

P. 236. "Orders and disorders," perhaps a quotation, but don't appear so and looks like a joke.

My criticisms on style will remind you of Gracchus denouncing sedition. But it is a great danger to carry the characteristics of every-day writing into a serious, learned, *gründlich* book. My theory is that in history the historian has to disappear and leave the facts and ideas objectively to produce their own effect.

Letter LXXIV

Are Campion's books rare?—Newman's view of the Council of Trent must not go "unreproved"—Ward's letter is not "a reasonable view, but a state of mind"—Educational topics should be discussed—Everything secret tends to degenerate—A high standard of education of clergy most wanted—The example of France—Asceticism by itself no security—The Council of Trent does not limit the range of studies at all—The Gaume controversy—Is the bulk of literature dangerous?

Aldenham, Wednesday [*January* 23, 1861].

Think well on't before you resolve to publish a volume of Campion's works. (1) How rare is the History of Ireland? (2) How good? (3) How likely to be read? I can answer none of these questions. I do not believe the *Rationes* would justify "very" as an answer to any of the three.

Wetherell is resolute because he does not want to commit the *Rambler* to a view opposed to Newman. What I care for most is that Newman's view of the Council of Trent should not go unreproved in the letter which, whoever writes it, is to be the most authoritative document of the controversy. Next to that my strongest consideration is of the hope- and use-lessness of disputing with Ward, whose letter* represents not a reasonable view, but a state of mind.

A very kind letter from Newman this morning highly approves of the late *Rambler* and particularly subscribes to my extravagantest utterances.†

* "Catholic Education," a letter by Dr Ward, was printed in the January *Rambler*, pp. 237-273.

† The article on "Döllinger's History of Christianity."

My own contribution to the discussion* must be very small, for I have not got the back numbers. But it must be established that all questions of this kind, not exclusively ecclesiastical, but social and interesting to all alike, require ventilation (1) for the enlightenment of those whose business practically it is to decide about them; (2) for the satisfaction of others and for inspiring them with confidence, giving security, etc.

Every thing secret degenerates, even the administration of justice; nothing is safe that does not show how it can bear discussion and publicity. The Church especially has been in the habit of appealing to the sense of the masses, to public opinion, as she is founded on conscience. For instance, the great movement of Hildebrand's age was begun by raising the laity of Northern Italy against the corrupt clergy (Pataria). But I don't know whether this historical argument will be of any use. Under Catholic absolutism the Church set to work in another way.

What is most wanted is a high standard of education in the clergy, without which we can neither have, except in rare cases, good preachers or men of taste or masters of style, or up to the knowledge, the ignorance and the errors of the day. They will have neither sympathy nor equality with the laity.

The example of France is conclusive. No clergy is more zealous, more ascetical, than the better sort of French priests. St Sulpice educates them for that but not for learning. So they are shut off from the lay world, they influence only the women, and instead of influencing society through the women help to dis-

* I.e., the education controversy raised by X.Y.Z.

organize, by separating the men and women. "Our wives," says Michelet, "have not been educated in the same faith as ourselves, hence decline of marriage in France." When the French clergy has a great man to show—Gratry, Ravignan, Lacordaire—his social influence is immense. For it is no answer to say that an ignorant clergy is good enough for an ignorant laity. They must be equal not only to lay Catholics, but also to Protestants, both lay and clerical. They must be educated with a view to the clever enemy, not only to the stupid friend.

Asceticism by itself is no security without knowledge. It is just as dangerous to faith in educated men, though not highly or sufficiently instructed, as knowledge is, by itself. One-sided view of things, ignorance of the world, ignorance of proportion and perspective in things purely religious, ignorance of the borderland where religion touches the outer world of life and ideas. There have been heresies of false asceticism just as there have of false speculation.

Taste for learning can be nourished only by reading the great writers, by *artes liberales*, not by prayer and seclusion.

Then I would define the *Rambler* as not a lay magazine either in its subjects, or its writers, or its purpose; and the notion of a lay magazine is foolish, which I suppose is what you said in the *Register*.

Then we ought to put aside Newman's view of the Council of Trent as a dangerous error. (1) The decree he quotes does not limit the range of studies at all. The terms are quite definite. Nor (2) does it settle anything about lay or Church students. As there were few and

imperfect schools for education in general for boys, it was decreed that every diocese should have an institution of the kind at least for the clergy, that they at least might be safely educated, but not to the express exclusion of others. I am positive about this, for I referred to the passage with Döllinger. Both Newman and X.Y.Z. are wrong as to the authority of the Council of Trent, and I suppose it would be best to set Newman right, as he is most in the wrong, by setting the other right. For X.Y.Z. says, Trent does not bind us, because it is not received here; but in fact that is not the reason, for its decrees in discipline are not absolute, but are modifiable and everywhere modified by time and place, and were themselves only what the Germans would call an historical phenomenon, a change with regard to the past changeable in the future. Newman is not wrong because the Council is not accepted in England; he would be equally wrong everywhere else and in every period except just that when the decrees were given.

Then X.Y.Z. quotes wrongly the Council of Constance as to tolerated heretics. The notion would be a contradiction in that age. None were tolerated or tolerable, but the words apply to excommunicated persons and the mode of dealing with them.

Then I suppose you will agree with me that he exaggerates the merits and the influence of the Anglican clergy. The Methodists are surely a warning to him. Before posting this, Sunday intervening, I have got through a good part of W. G. W[ard]. Newman never said a truer word than when he said that if we carefully define our views, controversy will generally be-

come hopeless or superfluous. There are two things which cannot be attacked in front: ignorance and narrow-mindedness. They can only be shaken by the simple development of the contrary qualities. They will not bear discussion. I cannot see that Ward's view is susceptible of discussion, or that his argument is fit to be seriously treated in the *Rambler*. D—— and many others are examples of men who study not to find out truths, but to find out proofs of what they already believe to be truths. Now this is in contradiction with the nature of research and arguments, and men of this sort must be passed by. If one can promote knowledge and common sense in general, their influence and dangerousness will go of itself.

The only serious thing seems to me the discussion (p. 249) of the literature which Ward puts in the third class. This is simply the Gaumé controversy. The ancient and the English classics are the substance of what he calls literature and denies their educative properties. Sophocles and Shakespeare, Cicero and Bacon are the types. Ward unjustly concentrates the whole into novels, romances of earthly passion, and argues therefrom, making no proper distinction (and indeed speaking like a heathen) between sensuality and love. Then one must surely distinguish between the danger of knowledge and the danger of exciting the imagination. They belong to different ages. The bulk of all literature is dangerous in the first way. Novels of course are dangerous during study periods because they distract and absorb, but I don't believe there is any of the other danger in most of Scott, Dickens, Thackeray or the later Bulwer's writings.

Ward seems to me so childish in his psychology and in the ignorance betrayed by his ideas of the French clergy that I cannot help thinking Oakeley and the Anon. will waste powder. You cannot convince by logic men attracted by such arguments as these.

Letter LXXV

The articles for the next *Rambler*—More letters on the education question from X.Y.Z. and Ward—Simpson's review of Ward

Aldenham, Thursday, [*March,* 1861].

I send you a MS. from Hennessy* which I think we ought to admit, although I do not agree with his decimal propensities (perhaps you, a mathematician, will), nor altogether in his dislike of anonymous writing, not at all in his ideas of orthography or his reverence for the Marquis of Normanby. But he is a writer in the *Atlantis*, and, I have heard, a clever man in his way, and then an Irishman. You see his name must be put in a note, saying it would be a contradiction, or something or other, not to put it to an article against "Anonymity."

I have told Oxenham that I should be able to tell whether his letter† would be dangerous when I saw it. It is in Bruton Street, and he says he leaves it to us to determine. Have you got Ward's letter?‡ I do

* "The Administration of Charitable Trusts," printed in the March number of the *Rambler*, 1861, pp. 314-322.

† Oxenham had written on the subject of Catholic Education, over the signature of X.Y.Z., in the *Rambler* for November, 1860, pp. 100-117. His letter, as indicated in other Letters of this correspondence, excited a heated controversy in the Catholic papers. The letter above referred to was a second letter in reply to his critics in May, 1861.

‡ Dr Ward's letter against Oxenham was printed in the *Rambler* for January, 1861, pp. 237-273.

not at all dispute the rightfulness of your severity on Ward,* only I wanted you to be quite sure of its justice. Not having read him I could not tell, or feel confidence unless I knew you had considered it again seriously.

I think all these letters ought to appear if you have no strong opinion the other way. But I hold myself neutral as to Oxenham's supplement, which is intended to finish his letter. Pray consider it. He is anxious about the renewal of the discussion.

I think I shall have an article ready on America,† and another is promised on Ireland, half of which I have read and about which I have undertaken that no questions should be asked, or at least that none should be answered. These, with your review of Ward ‡ for

* Simpson's letter on the educational controversy was printed in March, 1861, pp. 410-421, under the name "Derlox."

† "Political Causes of the American Revolution," May, 1861, pp. 17-61.

‡ "Dr Ward's Philosophy," ibid. pp. 61-80. On the publication of this review Ward wrote to Simpson as follows:

"*May* 22, 1861.

"I have read your article on my volume with great interest. I consider that in one respect at least I have no ground for exception. I mean that it is completely *bonâ fide*. I am perfectly confident that there has been no wish to attack me because of my antagonism to the *Rambler*, but on the contrary every wish to form and express a true judgement. On the other hand I think there is ground of exception in regard to the short time you have given to reading it: you speak of a *fortnight's* critical examination. I protested in February when I saw you, against your briefness of time. I am confident that, had you given longer time, you would have more correctly understood my meaning in various places.

"However, it is so ably done that it will be of great use to me, even where it is founded upon misconception; and on one or two matters you are right and I am wrong, even *me judice*. For instance, on p. 64, the words you have put within brackets, 'it is an obscurity of words,' etc., convict me of gross inaccuracy of statement; and you might have added to the list of such inaccuracies. I am not sure, however, that, except this one, there are any other adverse criticisms made by you with which I agree."

editorial, Campion,* Hennessy, Mrs B[astard], and Wetherell for "Communicated." I told Oxenham that his national letter must certainly not appear signed X.Y.Z.

As to my speech about Italy, I will not waste powder, make enemies and get into so much trouble without an object and an occasion. A man who never speaks cannot speak with effect on an unpopular question, and I do not know whether I could do any good at all, but at any rate only in the last extremity, when there is a vote on the existence of the ministry.

Letter LXXVI

Newman on the March *Rambler*—The Roman question getting acute—The debate on Italy in the House of Commons comes on to-morrow

House of Commons, [*Wednesday*, *March* 6, 1861.]

Newman writes that he likes the number, "though, of course, I cannot be expected to go along with the magazine in the views it holds about the clerical body." I have written to ask what he means. He says Ward was "comforted if not satisfied" by what I wrote in answer to his question, and pleased by what I said of him. That shows the delicacy of my touch. . .

I cannot help thinking that things must ripen at Rome in the next few weeks. Let us both read the news attentively this month, there is food for the historian. The Italian debate comes on again to-morrow. Edwin James, Peel, Edward Howard, Monsell, Grant

* Ibid., pp. 80-100.

Duff, etc., are going to speak, besides the chiefs. This is all that will be done about Italy for a while, and nothing will come of it. It is bad policy of the Catholics, and I have in vain disputed the point with Monsell and Lord Edward. If things come to a head this month, then we can speak out about Rome.

Letter LXXVII

Recommends Giesler's work to Simpson—Growth of the immunities of the clergy—Gregory VII established the Church's supremacy —Innocent III shaped the theory of Papal omnipotence

16 *Bruton Street, Thursday* [*March* 14, 1861].

I send you an additional volume in which you will find a number of curious passages quoted in the notes, pp. 205-243. They are cleverly selected so as to give a bad appearance to the Church, but they are perfectly authentic and fair as far as they go. You will find at your leisure the quotations in the notes throughout the volume curious and interesting; the text is stupid and worthless.

There is very little to read on the subject you are upon in each of the books I sent. You will not find it the work of many hours going through them, and you will confound criticism by the abundance of your knowledge and the confidence of your tread.

In an earlier volume of Giesler, which I have not in London, all the chief passages of the medieval decretals may be found: *Novit; Clericis laicos; Unam Sanctam*, etc. The next time you go to the Museum you might read that part of the book through in an hour. But

remember that there is a distinct difference between the theory of the Middle Ages and that of the sixteenth century.

Taking Gregory the Great as a starting-point, we find nothing in him of the system afterwards carried out, though he rebuked emperors freely. But then came the Teutonic (Carolingian) monarchy, which gave the Church (the bishops and abbots) great wealth in lands and immunity from the civil jurisdiction, so that their lands were called "Immunitates." Their power was so great that they ruled the State, and, in the ninth century, there are sayings of kings and emperors acknowledging that their crowns may be given or taken away by the prelates. I think you will find an Act of Charles the Bald to that effect quoted in Phillips and others. The feudal system developing found the clergy great landed proprietors, and being founded on landed property it proceeded to include them, subjecting them to its rule. Those were the days when nobody thought of the pope, and the influence of the Church was local, episcopal, not papal.

Gregory VII upset all this, for he found the clergy degraded and the Church subject; so he took the law into his own hands, reformed the clergy, and, to secure their good behaviour under papal authority, sought freedom for the Church in supremacy. Feudalism admitted no immunities. So to be free from its often oppressive control the only idea that occurred to Gregory was to make the pope suzerain of all States. Observe that this was part of the same proceeding that raised the papal authority so high over the bishops. The two things were connected—one was a necessity,

the other a means suggested by the times. Nothing can bear a more definitely marked character of a particular age and state of society than Hildebrand's plan. It is simply a turning of feudalism into an instrument of Church power and independence, instead of a source of oppression and secularisation, which it had become. Well, this plan was, in a great measure, realized at the beginning of the twelth century (1122), and then came a violent conflict with the emperors, and in the course of the war, as in the nature of things, the opposite views went into extremes and took an abstract speculative shape, no longer a local colouring. What helped this was the rise in the twelfth century, one hundred years after Gregory, of Roman law and of scholastic philosophy, both very abstract systematic affairs. With the help of these the Emperor Frederick I held that everything belonged to him, and Frederick II tried to blot out the papacy altogether, and Innocent III, a great lawyer and divine of the school of Paris, shaped a theory of papal omnipotence on a theological basis, floating in the air, not at all connected with the state of things then and there. Nothing is more striking than the abstract character of political speculation in the divines of that period. They know nothing of the times they live in, or of the practical working of government. All their examples are pagan, all their history ancient; the historical feeling had left them, and they did not know why Brutus or Judith were not quite applicable examples to their own times. The beginning of this, oddly enough, is in John of Salisbury, who had seen very closely the greatest contest of State and Church of those times. Yet his reasoning is altogether on Aristo-

telian premisses and on ancient instances. I think he is the first instance in time of this sort of speculation, quite disconnected from the circumstances of the time. So the popes and scholastics built up in mid-air a fabric without foundations and *quite in antagonism* with the facts and the spirit of the age. They defeated the Hohenstaufen and destroyed the Empire virtually because the emperors were quite in the wrong against them; but thenceforth in carrying out their system they were beaten at every turn. The last of the House of Staufen died in 1267, and the papacy seemed to have triumphed in the reign of Gregory X, who gave the empire to the Hapsburgs, when the decline at once set in with Martin IV and the French influence. The theory of papal omnipotence was repudiated by all. The crown of Sicily was given to Anjou in reverence for St Lewis, and excommunications launched, etc. But the Sicilians slew the French, defied the pope and *compelled him to yield*. That ought to have been the end of those theories. They started quite afresh in the sixteenth century, and the two must not be mixed up.

Letter LXXVIII

Is Simpson's review of Ward just?—Does not approve of the ending —Can the expression "though attributes of God" be allowed— The growth of papal power—The Guelphs and Ghibellines

Wednesday [*March* 20, 1861].

Your review of Ward* is so extremely severe that I earnestly hope that it is not unjust, for if he says

* In the article "Dr Ward's Philosophy" in the May *Rambler*.

what you attribute to him he deserves no better treatment. If you look through it again, pray consider how ill it would be done to leave an opening by which so wrong-headed a teacher might recover himself.

As to a conclusion, it is a maxim of Greek oratory to make the peroration tremendous, but to finish it with a few soothing words, as the Pythagoreans finished the day with a hymn. You, on the other hand, end, like a scorpion's tail, with a sting. This looks as if the article was written for the sake of attacking the book, whereas if you end gracefully as you began all the intermediate criticism seems forced upon your good nature by a sense of justice. If you think a general compliment would do as to the probable success of certain parts of his book that is to come, in spite of his general bad influence on youth, or on his genius and virtue, etc., I think the effect of the whole would be enhanced.

Is it right in the last lines of p. 176 to say "though attributes of God?" Is not an attribute independent of free appointment? I know nothing about it, but it strikes me so.

As to infidelity and mathematics (pp. 16 and 17), there is an excellent saying of Bp Watson of Landaff on the subject, which I will try to find at Aldenham. At the top of p. 17 should not the word "morally" be inserted before "oblige" to avoid a certain confusion?

I think Finlason is very impudent considering the favourable notice we have given him.* The question

* The article on "The Administration of Charitable Trusts," in the March number, was founded on two works of Mr W. F. Finlason.

of the rights of laymen had best be solved *ambulando* after Newman's article on the subject.*

I have no time for Ockam. That was altogether another phase or rather episode of the history of the papal authority. It starts from the peculiar attitude of the Observants in the fourteenth century, of which, in its esoteric history, little is known, because the works of the leaders, Olivi and Ubertinus, are exceedingly rare. Marsilius of Padua belongs to the same party and period, and Dante is generally mixed up with them. Just as the mendicant Orders sprung up in the reaction against a rich, pompous and courtly clergy, with a strong admixture of democracy, besides the primitive vow of poverty and alms-seeking, so a century later they fell into a reaction against the head of the Church for the same reason. The Dominicans soon got aristocratic and left the begging to the Franciscans. The great errors of the popes after Innocent IV and Gregory IX threw the best men into opposition, and produced a sort of spurious Ghibellinism, in which the old things and thoughts were inverted. The real Ghibellines, the party of the Hohenstaufen emperors, cared more for the State than for the Church, and were ready to sacrifice one to the other. The Guelfs were then defenders of the faith. But, after Boniface VIII, the Ghibellines wished to save the Church through the emperor from the pope (Dante, who was first of all a sincere Catholic; secondly, a patriotic Florentine, much less patriotic Italian, and only in the lowest degree what he is generally repre-

* "On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine," in the *Rambler* for July, 1859.

sented as, an imperialist). After the catastrophe the antagonism increased between the spiritualists and the (papal) court (Guelfs') party, because the papacy had not only ceased to be spiritual but had also ceased to be universal. Suspicion of Avignon heightened the dislike of the worldly papacy, and the Bavarian emperor personified the feeling. He was excommunicated of course by the fiery old Pope, John XII, but the Pope was not all in the right, and the confidence of the Church was lost by the papacy in the fourteenth century. The Bavarians have always defended their emperor, and he has a great tomb in the cathedral of Munich, though excommunicate. Ockam died there too. He and Marsilius were the theorists of that dispute, which has one foot on the Dantesque Ghibellinism and another on the Franciscan opposition, both intensified and combined by dislike of Avignon. Episodes in that affair, as Rienzi and the rise of the Viscontis at Milan. The echo of it is in the letters of St Catherine of Siena. Pray note the gradations of decline. (1) The Frenchified papacy bearded by the Sicilians. (2) Boniface VIII outraged by the French. (3) Seventy years' captivity. (4) Schism of the West. (5) Attempt to govern the Church by General Councils—Constance, Pisa, Basle. (6) The six wicked Popes: Innocent VIII, Sixtus IV, Alexander VI, etc. (7) Reformation.

Guelf and Ghibelline are names which changed their meanings as much as Whig and Tory. For at last the Guelfs, who had been defenders of the freedom of the Church, became defenders of the power of the pope, a regular court party, postponing the

rights and welfare of the Church to the interests of the papacy—separating the two, in fact, whilst pretending to make them identical. So, while I hate the Ghibellines of the twelfth century, I don't like the Guelfs of the fourteenth, and Dante is condemned for saying in his time what I would say in ours. He did not stop at the consideration of what would suit the popes, but went on to think of the good of religion and of certain morals, rights and duties, beyond certain religious or rather ecclesiastical interests. The papacy had forfeited the leadership, and the life of the Church beat more warmly in other places than at the head. Have we not lived to see the same thing? The revival of faith in this century has left the papacy behind.

Barclay is admirable. There are several works of his full of learning, and a defence of him by his son, the great Latinist. I shall be at Aldenham next week, and I will, if you please, send you more books: Gieseler, my marked copy of Gregory VII, of Innocent III, of John of Salisbury, etc., and divers others. Also any of the books quoted by Phillips. Bellarmine's book was not permanently on the Index, I believe.

If this subject interests you and you have time to go into it, without reading up, which is unnecessary, any of the old writers themselves, it will be really valuable. After Pius V there was more discussion. First in France at the time of the Ligue, which produced loads of speculation on political and ecclesiastical affairs. Bellarmine went through the siege of Paris, and was in the midst of all these disputes. Strange to say, a leading Ligueur and consequently democrat, a friend that is of popular sovereignty under a religious sanction, became

the founder of advanced Gallicanism, *Richer;* whilst *Duperron*, who hated the Ligue and stuck to the king, when he was yet a Protestant, was the greatest adversary of Gallicanism, and compelled, in a great speech that is extant, the Estates of 1614—the last before 1789—to abandon a Gallican proposal. Then, soon after, there was the dispute about the English oath, which went into the same questions. Contemporaneously with this appeared a Protestant plan for the predominance of the Pope as moderator in Europe, and Henry IV's design —all dissipated by Richelieu and the compromise of the peace of Westphalia.

Letter LXXIX.

Acton's article on "The Political Causes of the American Revolution"—Hopes that Oxenham's review of Goldwin Smith may provoke a letter from Newman—Austria must have several pages in "Current Events"—War seems near at hand

16, *Bruton Street, Tuesday* [*April* 9, 1861].

My American article* will be very long, perhaps thirty pages. I am sure of the other political one. Yours on Ward, and probably "Campion," is ready. I send you a review by Oxenham of Goldwin Smith and his letter. There is no offence in the letter and very little point. He does not get hold of the question at all, and is, I believe, quite wrong in several things. But as it may provoke a letter from Newman on University education, with whom I have lately spoken a great deal on that point, it is well. Pray see whether

* "Political Causes of the American Revolution," which appeared in the May number.

he takes your view of morality in his review. The authorship of the letter must be kept secret, although there is no harm in it.

We ought also to review Macaulay* and the Life of Pitt.† I will send you my notes on each, if you please, as I have read the two first and shall read the other one of these. You can then at your leisure put in the results of your reading, as corrections or additions. A short notice of Montalembert would be also very timely, if we get it. Do not let us bother Wetherell for "Current Events"; I can do a good deal of disquisition, if some day you can string the facts and dates together with as little or as much animadversion as you choose. I do not understand the Polish affairs at all. Austria will deserve several pages,‡ also Cavour's speech on Rome, whose reference to Sarpi, Giannone and Arnold of Brescia (of whom nothing certain is known in detail, but there is a tradition in Italy from Nicolini's tragedy, who has clothed him with a mythic garment like Numa Pompilius) is gloriously conclusive against him, for this is worse than Josephism, and I am glad to find Sardinia at her best worse than Austria at her worst. It is as you say decisive against the possibility of the Church coming to terms with the kingdom of Italy, decisive therefore in favour of speedy flight. Then the French or English debates on Italy and Schleswig Holstein must be notices, and these, if you like, I will try and explain.

* Macaulay's *History*, begun in 1849, was finished this year 1861.

† Probably Lord Mahon's (Stanhope's) fifth edition of the *Life of Pitt*, the first volume of which appeared at this time.

‡ In "Foreign Affairs" of the May *Rambler*, pp. 134 seq.

War seems to be very near at hand.* I hope God will defend the right, but it is a dismal prospect.

Letter LXXX

Books on the "deposing power"—Criticizes Simpson's third chapter of Campion's life—True meaning of "Gallican"—Mistakes in papal policy—The safe conduct of Huss—The conversion of Bohemia

16 *Bruton Street, Monday* [*April* 10, 1861].

The article on Campion† is not quite so carefully written as the two first, I think. As to the boundless question of the deposing power, the books, which have not arrived, as they are coming by slow train, will probably enable you to speak with greater confidence and precision. Wetherell, I expect, can tell you exactly what Dante says of the maltreatment of Boniface. My words were a reminiscence of Macaulay on Ranke.

As to new books, will it be any good to subscribe to Mudie's out of the *Rambler* funds, and distribute among us and our friends the books we get for prompt review, arranging with Mudie for the sort of literature?

Don't quote Eckard for the sixteenth century unless you have good reason. In a book of original research the authorities ought always to be *primary*.

I make my notes on Campion as I go along: p. 2, Otho of Freising lived long after Gregory VII, so I have modified your expression, and the excom-

* The Schleswig-Holstein difficulty became acute in the early part of this year, and in January Denmark announced that war would be declared if Prussian soldiers enter the duchies.

† The article—third on Campion—appeared in May, 1861.

municated emperor was Henry IV, not III as you had written. P. 5, I have expunged the word "Gallican," as applied to More, not because I am sure it is inappropriate, in one sense, but because it is a term that includes a wide range of opinions, from Bossuet almost to Cavour. Thousands of Catholics of old believed as More did, before there were Ultramontanes. One party did not turn off to the right until another had turned off to the left of the good old pre-Hildebrandine straight line (or rather pre-pseudo-Isidorian). It seems to me hardly fair to apply the term Gallican to all who deny the extreme papal opinions, because then it makes Gallicanism include the right view. You must, at the same time, by the same rule, term Ultramontane all who differ from the errors of Gallicanism—so that it is also a name for the right view. There ought not to be a negative definition of the term.

By the by, do you know all Sir T. More said about the right of Parliament to bestow the crown, and what bearing his opinion has upon 1688 and the Regency question in 1788?

P. 6, you cite admirably the instance of William against Paul IV, but you say William and Gregory VII. Now it was Alexander II who blessed the standard and encouraged the invasion of England in 1066, and did not die till 1077. So I have changed the name. It is true Gregory VII was his Antonelli at the time, and approved of William when he became Pope; still it was Alexander who was the real approver.

What you say of the mistakes of the papal policy I think very good. Paul IV, Caraffa, was an enthusiast who quarrelled with Philip II, the best of Catholics, an

impracticable man. Pius IV was no good, and his short reign would have been calamitous but for his nephew, Charles Borromeo, who governed the Church under him at the age when Pitt became minister here. Pius V, a Dominican, as narrow-minded as a saint can be, suspicious, zealous to fanaticism, unbending, but not altogether straightforward. You say naught on the question of publication of the Bull. I have heard Grant say it never was published. A. 2. The court was at Prague in 1573, but Ferdinand was not emperor, so I have struck out the passage where his name occurs. Ferdinand I died 1564, Ferdinand II succeeded 1619, whereby hangs the bloody tale of the Thirty Years' war.

Avellanedo's empress was the wife either of Max II or of Rodolph. Remember that Emperor Maximilian grievously inclined to Protestantism, if he turns up in your reading. I have struck out, A. 3, your remarks on the safe conduct of Hus. The emperor could not guarantee him, going to his trial, against the consequences of his judgement. It is admitted that no complaint lies against either Council or emperor on the subject. I have not put in its place what you might have added, that Hussitism created German University life. For Hussitism was a national heresy—a revival of the Czech nationality, etc.—so the German Catholic student fled from Prague and founded the University of Leipzig, the first in Germany.

Then I have had to change your words attributing the final measures to restore religion in Bohemia, 1620, to the progress restoration had already made. It was the consequence of the rebellion, 1618, when they elected a Protestant king and were put down by Tilly (No-

vember, 1620). Ferdinand took the opportunity to use severe measures, but it was a reaction, and Caraffa's account is not strictly historical. The emperor had little or no authority in Prague from 1609 to 1620, and the two first emperors who reigned during that period, Rodolph and Mathias, were not zealous Catholics and did little for religion. Ferdinand, the best of the Hapsburgs, only recovered his authority in Bohemia by the victory on the White Mountain.

Caraffa's remark is puerile about the difficulty of converting Bohemians as compared with the people in the Palatinate, Tilly's next conquest. The people in the Palatinate had already changed their religion four times within the memory of the old inhabitants, each time with little trouble or resistance. At each new reign after 1550 they were changed, first to Lutherans, then to Calvinists, then Lutherans, then Calvinists again, and so Tilly found them in 1623. But in Bohemia Utraquism was the national faith, by which Bohemia had been made a great nation and for a time independent (besides Protestantism had had time to take root in the Austrian provinces), and with which their patriotism was linked, by which it had been set in motion, like that of the Saracens by Islamism. . .

I have brought more books for you.

Letter LXXXI

Gladstone's "Budget"—Döllinger's public lecture on the Roman question—Medieval colouring in John of Salisbury

37 *Half Moon Street, Monday night* [*April* 15, 1861].

Gladstone has brought forward his Budget* in a very tame, straightforward speech, and it is, on the whole, well received. I rejoice at the confirmation it contains of my view that he is not inclined to democracy or to class legislation, but tries to carry out true principles of economy. He spoke very well on direct and indirect taxation, and balanced different interests by remitting a penny of direct taxation and removing at the same time the paper duty.

Döllinger seems to have pronounced himself distinctly at last on the Roman question in a public lecture at which the Nuncio was offended and walked away. I shall soon learn the details, and I hope to get the lecture.†

I think you will find Innocent III's policy as distinguished from that of his predecessors pretty clear in the first volume. "Novit" is chiefly interesting as bearing the germ of the views of Boniface VIII (*Unam Sanctam*). But there are half a dozen of his decretals, if I remember right, so beginning.

* The Budget was brought forward on this day, April 15. It proposed to reduce the income tax from 10d. to 8d., to abolish the paper duties and to re-enact the existing duties on tea and sugar for another year.

† An account of this lecture may be seen in the "Current Events" in the *Rambler* for May, 1861, p. 139.

Observe the medieval colouring one gets from the passages I have marked in John of Salisbury.

Letter LXXXII

Newman's views on the Roman question—At Gladstone's there was a pamphlet by Passaglia on the same—Gave the party at Gladstone's an abstract of his American article

House of Commons, Thursday [*May* 2, 1861].

I saw Newman, who was full of your praises. He said exactly what I have said on the Roman question, as to the general change of feeling in the new direction, the weight of authority all one side, the time for speech and the time for silence, the futility of the bishops, the blessing of the revolution, etc. He ought to be ashamed not to pronounce himself.

At Gladstone's this morning, where I breakfasted with Sam Oxon,* I saw Passaglia's pamphlet,† which is eloquent, diffuse, and going as far as possible in saying that the temporal power is lost, and that without detriment to religion. He says all I attributed to him and more. But the publication is secret, printed at Rome, it bears *Asisi* (with one *s*) on the title page—a misprint meant to save the lie—and the authorship is carefully concealed. It is, however, quite fair that we should bring him forward, and there will be some astonishment. There is only one copy in England. I delivered a brief and, therefore, improved abstract of my American article, to the astonishment and admira-

* Bishop Wilberforce of Oxford.

† On the Roman question and the Temporal Power.

tion of the ignorant audience, especially of the ignorant Gladstone. I had to say a great deal about the Roman question. Our chances in workhouses are looking up.

Letter LXXXIII

High opinion of Simpson's paper on "Reason and Faith"—Shall a proof go to de Buck at Brussels, or to Newman?

Saturday [*June* 1, 1861].

I think very highly of your paper on faith and science,* and have ventured only on one or two very slight changes, that have nothing to do with the philosophy of the thing. It should be in the editorial part. Will you send a proof to Brussels, or shall I send one to Birmingham,† in order to escape the imputation of writing on theology without revision?

Letter LXXXIV

Advises Simpson not to reply to critics—It is a very difficult thing to meet adversaries by a letter—Would urge him to pursue his studies on the political power of the Popes—Newman's letter on the Council of Trent—A review of Dr Doyle's life

37 *Half Moon Street, Monday night*
[*June* 10, 1861].

I shall be very much disappointed if you will not allow me to beg of you not to insist on the insertion of your letter. I really do not think it will do any good, or help to bridge over the chasm between truth

* This was the first of two articles on "Reason and Faith," by Simpson, which appeared in the *Rambler* in the months of July and September.

† For the criticism of the Bollandist de Buck or for that of Newman.

and error and reconcile the friends of the one with the slaves of the other. Consider how vast, powerful, deeply-rooted the system is that we have to combat. You cannot demolish Protestantism, or even establish a presumption or a prejudice against it by a short letter of this kind. Our enemy is just as large and strong a manifestation of the evil one as Protestantism, and needs wider and fuller treatment. We meet Satan not by argument so much as by example—by going to walk the other way; not by confuting him. No wonder each time we do so we provoke his angry roar, and it is of no use complaining each time of it. As to the present case, I have no wish to answer those who have attacked me, and I think it is wiser not to heed them, for they will live for ever, like Nabuchodonosor the king, and will not stop crying because they are beaten. You are certainly attacked absurdly by Thompson, and I hear a Dominican says he would like to have the burning of you; but your letter is not a sufficient answer to Thompson on the ground of historic truth and veracity. It is a wider question. Your best answer would be, I think, to pursue the question of the political power of the popes, for which you have rich materials, and to go on with Campion without innuendo, as if everybody agreed with you.

Can you come for me to the House of Commons on Wednesday at three forty-five? I will show you what Caccia sends, and a letter on Trent sent and recommended by Newman, which has so moved my indignation that I have told him that without his accompanying note I should not think of admitting it. I hope Oakeley is safe. I cannot finish "Nationality"

till I am off my railway committee; I hope this week. But I can make it as long as you like, and introduce almost any political topic. De Vere promises a September review of Dr Doyle.* Cullen has sent me the life of Archbishop Plunket. Shall we ask Todd to review it? Can you give your leisure to making up a chronicle of events since February?—as dry as you like. I will annotate? I have sixteen pages from Newman, extremely confidential and affectionate. He recognizes the point at him in the last summary, and thinks he has done a great deal in submitting to the allusion.

Letter LXXXV

Has seen Cardinal Wiseman at Thorndon—Newman much annoyed at what he calls Simpson's "habit of pea-shooting at any dignitary"—In principle Newman agrees with the *Rambler*

37 *Half Moon Street, Sunday* [*July* 19, 1861].

I saw a good deal of the Cardinal at Thorndon last week. He was cold at first, but I warmed him with literary conversation, and the people there remarked how much we babbled gently together. There was a story that he had heard of my saying that there was bad Latin in his lecture, but he accepted my compliments about that and the Academy with good grace.

I will write a political article, and I hope you will have the grace to do some current events. De Vere promises a review of Dr Doyle. Do not put in about

* This appeared in two articles, called "The Life of Dr Doyle," in the *Rambler* for September and November.

the Flaminian gate; I have all the pains in the world to keep Newman in good humour. He is so much riled at what he pleasantly calls your habit of pea-shooting at any dignitary who looks out of the window as you pass along the road, that I am afraid he will not stand by us if we are censured. But he will be very indignant with the authorities, and declares that he agrees with us in principle entirely.

Letter LXXXVI

Acton's reasons for disagreeing with Simpson's views on the action of Moral and Physical Sciences on Religion—The battle of the Church has to be fought in each age with the weapons of that age—Natural science not attacking religion now as formerly—Is pressed to go to Munich, where Dupanloup is to be

Aldenham [*September* 3, 1861].

I dare say there is hardly any question on which we are less likely to agree than the one you start.* (1) You unjustly compare all the physical sciences to history only. I include all the moral sciences, philosophy, law, languages, etc. (2) It is not a mere question of statistics, because I admitted that to the uneducated mind, or rather imagination, difficulties derived from natural phenomena are more impressive than the others, which only educated men can understand. So I conceded numbers to your view beforehand. (3) Objections to the Church from natural science are made only in the name of unbelief, but are the basis of Protestantism and of every heresy, and in one sense of every false religion.

* A reply to a letter on "The Incidence of Moral and Physical Sciences on Religion."

(4) The battle of the Church is fought in each age on the battlefield and with the weapons of that age. Whatever is the absorbing problem of the day is sure to be brought to bear upon her. Now, putting the question of controversy aside, the character of the present day is much more strongly marked by the discoveries in the moral than in physical science. The science of history and the science of language, and the philosophical study of jurisprudence, are all new discoveries of this century. Before this, historical controversy was nonsense, for the materials were imperfect, and the method did not exist. There is as great a difference between history now and in Gibbon's time as between the astronomy before Copernicus and after him. For this reason the controversy on this point is of greater consequence.

(5) Scientific attacks touch not the Church only, but other religions are her allies in the conflict. But historic and philosophic objections are made against her by every system, and here she has no ally. (6) Speaking widely, I do not see that natural science is attacking religion now as it did formerly. Germany is the home of every sort of unbelief, but the bulk of eminent men of science is certainly not so uniformly infidel there as the historians or philosophers or divines. That is only one country, you will say, and it may be different here; but it is of all countries the most advanced in the ways of unbelief; it feeds the irreligion of other lands, and there is no stronger proof of its superiority than the contempt with which such books as Buckle's are received there. (7) In astronomy the greatest of the astronomers, Mädler, who discovered

the system of the fixed stars, or central sun, is no enemy of religion; and in geology, which amuses us so much, the Neptunist revival is entirely a Christian movement in its tendency. So I might go on for a long time. You say your experience is the other way, and that is a sufficient answer to all this. As for me, I have no experience of a mind forgetful of progression by antagonism and conceiving that opinions upon which the masters of science are not agreed, among whom at all times there have been zealous Christians, are really in contradiction with faith. Some of the chief objections—I suppose the greatest of all—that which denies the unity of the human race, may be advanced at a greater advantage in philology and ethnology than in physiology. At least I know that the greatest and most infidel of the German naturalists said that he had no serious argument whatever against the unity, which is certainly not yet the case in the science of languages.

But I am not only entirely ignorant on all these topics, but probably extremely prejudiced. People who are anxious about the bearing of scientific discoveries always remind me of those who are so eager to prove the existence of Catholic dogmas in very early times; for both seem to me to overlook the theory of growth.

Many thanks for the information about the plot. I was surprised to find among old books a manuscript report of those speeches, and wished to know if they were a curiosity. I have no friends in the *Athenæum*, that I know of; but I will try the *Saturday*. Send them a copy. Thanks for mine beforehand: I shall not get it before I go, for I am much pressed to be at Munich for the meeting, which begins on Sunday. Dupanloup

is to be there, and it cannot be but that the Italian question will be discussed.

I have not got on with "Nationality,"* because in order to establish its revolutionary character I wanted to read the debates of the Convention in Robespierre's time, which I have been doing, but not yet writing. Eight pages are written of an Austrian article out of thirty or more; but I shall know more about Austria before I come back, which will not be, I think, later than the end of the month.

If a second Doyle† is sent, pray cut off the sweetness and flabbiness. I did a good deal this time, but not enough.

Letter LXXXVII

Question of starting a new Review founded upon the amalgamation of the *Rambler* and *Dublin*—Would agree to any arrangement by which Newman was made editor—On other lines the *Rambler* cannot coalesce—Hopes to get an article on Döllinger and the Temporal Power

Munich, Tuesday [*September* 10, 1861].

It is‡ of course the complement of Manning's insinuations to me two months ago, and of the proposal made to me by Burns somewhat earlier. At that time there was no question of amalgamating the *Rambler*. That is proposed now that the necessity of destroying

* This article by Acton appeared in the first number of *The Home and Foreign Review*, which took the place of the *Rambler* as a quarterly publication in July, 1862.

† The second article on "The Life of Dr Doyle" appeared in the November number of the *Rambler*.

‡ The suggestion now made as to the possible amalgamation of the *Rambler* and the *Dublin Review*.

us is more keenly felt. The first thing that occurs to me is that it is well to learn as much as possible if we can provoke a further communication. This would be done by your saying that I was abroad, and that they had better tell me about it too. Or else you might say, if you agree to it, that for my part I would agree to any arrangement by which Newman should be made editor, but that none of the other names give me a guarantee for Catholic principles in the conduct of the Review. You might even say, for it is a fact, that the bishops have told me they would have no thorough confidence in any convert but Newman, for I observe all Burns's men are converts.

A further ingenious dodge would be to throw on me this responsibility of consenting on condition of Newman's assuming the reins, and to answer for yourself that you will be ready to listen to terms and to join those men in carrying on a review if a new one is started. This would be justified by Burns's letter, and would be a fair reply. It might break the edge of the opposition to a certain extent, and I do not see that we can prevent the new journal from being commenced. It is also very probable that they will do us considerable mischief. Our policy must be decided by the position they assume towards us. We must also try to secure the continued assistance of some of our best men, as Stokes, Arnold, Oxenham, all of whom I think are with us in principle. If they begin attacks upon us, I look forward to Allies's historical articles, yea, and Thompson's, to scatter them to the four winds, leaving Ward and Co. to your gentle touch.

In short, nothing seems clearer to me than that they

must begin the fight, except that the *Rambler* cannot coalesce. Northcote I knew, but how comes Macmullen among these men? He has been getting more and more angry with me, like most people, this year; but I thought you would have kept him in order.

By all means reward Stokes for his much study by inserting as many articles as he is ready to write. I arrived here in the midst of the Catholic meeting, and was asked to speak on Catholicism in England; but a timely sore throat has laid me up and saved me from the misery of making and hearing speeches. I made acquaintance with a remarkable man, Dr Michelis, of Munster, who believes, like you, in natural science, and, faithful to the same similitude, is greatly persecuted by the zealots and Romans. He prepared a speech on the contrast of Roman and German research, quite in the style of the *Rambler*, and he has put himself at the head of a singular kind of union with Protestants, barring always religion, on grounds of science, politics and patriotism. If I can, as I hope, get ready an article on Döllinger,* I may manage to bring him in, pointing out tacitly the analogy with us.

* This article, "Döllinger and the Temporal Power," appeared in the November number of the *Rambler*.

Letter LXXXVIII

Döllinger's book will soon be ready—There are things in it to make "each particular hair stand on end"—Materials for the next number of the *Rambler*—Montalembert's *Monks of the West* written with a purpose, not for learning's sake—The Indian debates show the folly of abolishing the old Company and the incapacity of Parliament to deal with India

Munich, Thursday [*September* 25, 1861].

Ever since I wrote to you I have been laid up, several days in bed, and not yet allowed to go out. Of your charity send me a few lines about what has been going on. Having lost so much time, and being due at Berlin in the middle of October, I cannot come home before the end of next month.

Döllinger's book* will soon be ready, and I hope I can manage to send you an account of it. I will do it very gently, but there are things in the book to make each particular hair to stand on end, so it will not be well to put overmuch in the other articles. What have you? I prayed de Vere to send his "Doyle" to Burns, where I suppose you will find it. Green, of Aldenham, will, if reminded, have a letter ready,† which I partly read, and perhaps a communicated article. If Mrs B. is well, she will send a paper on "Rio," if asked for.

I hope Wetherell's promise of amendment [i.e., in health] has been kept. If he reviews the *Monks of the West*, pray get him to animadvert on its being a book with a tendency, not written for learning's sake, but

* *Kirche und Kirchen, Papsthum und Kirchenstaat*, Munich, 1861.

† This letter, on "Oaths," appeared in the *Rambler* for January, 1862.

for an external political momentary purpose, therefore without the dignity of real history in its design, though very good in great part of the execution. This is a canon of criticism to which we must hold fast if we are to insist on more serious and conscientious and disinterested study. *La vérité quand même*. There is no other excuse for instance for having refused a notice of Morris's *Thomas 'Becket*, which is full of research, but is a panegyric, professedly not a history.

I hope I need not warn you against Montalembert's declamation about Poland. He has no idea of the insanity of nationality, or of political right supreme above apparent religious interest. He exaggerates, moreover, the power of the national *verein*, though it is by no means inconsiderable.

Surely things are coming to a head in Italy. Döllinger has produced a comical enthusiasm here by a declaration on the Temporal Power which leaves intact the whole question on which he expressed such startling opinions, and good people will be grievously troubled when his book appears after this innocent manifesto.

If Wetherell is up to it, there ought to be an Indian retrospective chapter in "Current Events." The moral of the Indian debates was the folly of abolishing the Company, from the incapacity of Parliament to deal with India, besides the anomaly of a constitutional assembly governing despotically with one hand and politically with the other. Also it was wrong to centralize unnecessarily. Divided, or rather multiplied, authorities are the foundation of good government. As to the details, I do not understand them, but there was clearly very great uncertainty and frequent change.

Letter LXXXIX

Discussion of the scheme of amalgamation under Newman—Of course Newman would regard the *Rambler* as a *damnosa hereditas* —The position different to what it was in 1859—The *Rambler* is likely to be soon in the wars; but it would be a tactical error to begin

Munich [*October* 1, 1861].

You must have received my last letter while yours, full of important news, was on the way. My illness, together with my promise to be at Berlin with Lord Granville in the middle of this month, compelled me to give up my intention of coming home this week, and I have got new engagements now which make it all but impossible for me to go home now, although your letter makes me wish very much to discuss these grave matters with you.

I think our conditional agreement to any arrangement which should give the supreme power over the new journal to Newman, and Burns's unconditional refusal to allow of Newman's interference, gives us a morally strong position. If any one should say that to propose Newman as future editor was a mere dodge, because we knew he would not accept it from what passed two years ago, this would be foolish and frivolous. For the *Rambler*, which he formerly took out of our hands and soon gave up, was a *damnosa hereditas;* he took it with its sins upon it, and accepted the solidarity of our objectionable traditions. Moreover, he depended mainly upon the old staff to assist him in carry-

ing it on. He was grafted on the old stock. But in this new scheme he would be at the head, not of the old group of the *Rambler*, but of the leading writers in general who would all be pledged to help the new phase of the magazine, and who would be in a triumphant position as having just destroyed our monopoly. Newman would find himself on a very advantageous pinnacle, instead of being, as he was in 1859, in a fix, and if all these men had, *bonâ fide*, consented to take him for editor, it would be really absurd to cite the events of 1859 as a proof that he would not accept the offer made under such different circumstances. It is true, however, that Newman has no greater liking for Burns than Burns has for him, and I do not think he would actively assist us now in our difficulty; but I am not sure.

I conclude that when you got my last letter, you did not hesitate to call on the Protestant publishers. I will agree in any business arrangements you find it necessary to make. With Burns's letter about not publishing with his name in your hand, you can, of course, ask Northcote for the books, as a matter of course. It would be best to do that part of the work while Northcote is in power, and to make no allusion to the negotiations, regarding the whole scheme of amalgamation as destroyed by the rejection of Newman, and considering ourselves simply as set adrift by Burns.

It is time, of course, to inform Newman of the use we have made of his name. After writing to you I wrote an explanation to him, but on second thoughts did not send it, as I did not know the course you might take. In speaking of what we did it would be well to show

how we could, *bonâ fide*, propose to remit the *Rambler* into his hands in consequence of the altered situation.

I shall manage to send you an article. Manning's book seems rather an improvement on his old views. The result of all this is that we shall soon have a regular opposition and open war declared by the other side. We must collect our forces for the encounter, and get some help from the Protestant press.

It will be a prodigious tactical error if we begin the attack, or if, in consequence of these events, we go farther to the left. We may speak more openly, that is true, and a blessing; but we must not speak more one-sidedly or partially. On the contrary, our dodge is not to leave them any legitimate ground which they can occupy to our exclusion on the great questions of the day. It must not be said that in our new position we confine our view to one aspect of things, or that we overlook important considerations in the eagerness to help a particular opinion to its rights. Especially we ought not to be more hard or bitter in consequence of persecution. There cannot be a higher cause or a better position than that we have taken, and it should not be soiled or spoiled by personal things.

If you have to issue circulars, etc., and will let me see them, anything sent to Munich before the end of next week will reach me. There ought not to be too great a contrast between any manifesto you issue and Newman's of old. Harmony of religion with free science and with just claims of social progress, and with political right and freedom would be good and not inconsistent topics.

Letter XC

The new publishers of the *Rambler*—We must justify our character as the "lay-Catholic organ"—Montalembert's speeches and pamphlets should be reviewed—Question of what becomes of Peter's Pence—Is it spent on government?—Naples a great difficulty in the present question

Munich, Thursday [*October* 3, 1861].

I think you had a good inspiration in going to Williams and Norgate, and I telegraphed to you to-day to that effect. We have long had dealings together, and they are both men of considerable literary attainments. Besides, they are quite of the free school in matters of religion, and they have a very extensive connexion among men of letters. I hope you have come to terms with them.* They can certainly push us, to some extent, among Protestants, also in America. Then they will get us advertisements. Would it be feasible e'en now to get Smith to put us on the railway-stalls? We should not be much read, but it may strew a little popish seed in the minds of casual travellers. We must trim our sails according to the new state of the weather, justifying our character before the world as the lay-Catholic organ. For this we must seek up subjects generally interesting, and those Catholic questions especially about which Protestants are curious, and we must

* Williams and Norgate published the number of the *Rambler* for November, 1861, and a note at the end of the number announces this to "Readers and Correspondents." The managers take the opportunity to declare that their only object was "to co-operate with Catholic periodicals of higher pretensions in a work of especial importance in the present day—the refinement, enlargement and elevation of the intellect in the educated classes."

secularize ourselves as much as possible and have no more than is necessary of what resembles theology. There is only one point here which I think ought not to be abandoned, and that is Irenics with the Union party; avoiding controversy as much as possible, but giving them a helping share. No Catholics have done this for them yet, except Phillipps, and he badly. I asked Döllinger whether he thought converts or natives could do this best, and he had many arguments in favour of the latter. But are they to be had? Would Maguire or Collingridge do? An excellent topic for an early number will be a review of Montalembert as a Catholic politician in the seven volumes of his speeches and pamphlets. It would be a capital opportunity to express views on great subjects on which Protestants are curious. Do you recommend Arnold for it, or Wetherell, or will you do it yourself with any help I can contribute? You must prepare from time to time a slashing review. I think we shall do. A letter to de Vere, *Athenæum*, to be forwarded, will reach him. Make sure there are no MSS. lying at Burns's. There was some talk of a man who knows Russian, and was willing to write—a useful speciality from its rarity.

I have given up newspapers altogether, and really do not know much about Ricasoli. The *Spectator* will make chronicling easy. The Piedmontese are evidently spending their strength on Naples. I was told last November that the Neapolitans would hold out at least a year. They are not mere bands of brigands, but organized and paid by the King of Naples, with his own coin, I am told, but whether he has saved his mint or uses the Pope's I don't know. I am assured that the

organizer of the resistance in Naples is, or was, Mérode, though this is vehemently denied. It is a supremely important question, for what becomes of Peter's Pence? Calculate the whole sum it has sent to Rome (it has lately stood in the *Weekly Register*), compare it with the expenses of government in the little remaining State, and the Cardinals' salaries, and Nuncios—and there is a great excess. In Rome all pensions, etc., are cut down for Peter's Pence. That proves that they understand thereby a fund not for government, but for armament. They talk of an army of their own—but this is iniquitous or hypocritical. The French preserve peace and keep off the Sardinians. Without them the 8,000 mercenaries Mérode talks of could certainly not do it. What is the use of them, or spending money and blood for nothing? Argal, I think it is pretty clear where St Peter's Pence go to and whence the insurgents' payments come from. The solidarity with Naples is the great evil of the present situation. It has gone on increasing, and the most remarkable document is the rebuke to the Bishop of Ariano. Read it—in the *Ami* last week. Here they set up the absolute principles of legitimacy, so that no legitimate throne can be upset for misgovernment, etc.; they ignore the duty of submission to government *de facto*, though in Naples, of course, this is problematical; they remind the bishop of excommunication *latæ sententiæ* (*ipso facto*) for all who encourage spoliation, which is obviously out of the question. For they still protest against various spoliations, and yet do not refuse communion to the government. Francis II was not, strictly speaking, lawful king in the eyes of Rome, since the feudal right of the Holy

See who gave the Sicilian crown has been denied. My grandfather threw it off by refusing the symbol, an annual white horse. If you go into this point of a league with Naples, in the *Chronicle*, and the natural anxiety of Piedmont to put down this opposition and the impossibility of their looking with friendly eyes upon the Pope, you come to the Pence question, which is a delicate one. There is one danger coming up anew, that, in order to remain in Rome, they may accept terms. This ought to be pointed out with protest beforehand. Passaglia, etc., do not consider this a peril in their patriotism.

Letter XCI

Newman's opinion that the *Rambler* should come to an end—He thought that Antonelli would "strike" either through the Index or the bishops—Hopes that Simpson will not take advantage or change "for more vigorous and bitter polemics"—Disapproves of his "nature and highly cultivated pugnacity"—Discussion of "all questions not decided by the authority of the Church" to be possible

Munich [*October* 6, 1861].

I rejoice extremely at your agreement with Williams and Norgate. Encourage him to advertise and to procure advertisements for us. As to Kelly, I hope we shall keep him. Arnold never answered, and maybe never received my letter on those arrangements, and I was afraid to multiply written descriptions of them. I suppose Williams and Norgate will give Kelly the ordinary rights, and we must turn him to the utmost attainable account. . . Will not Dolman ultimately get into the same predicament as Burns? I see very little

security for a peaceful and durable harmony with him, unless, matters having been explained fully, he will enter into the spirit of the thing. Maguire might be of use if you determine to negotiate with him. At a distance, and without discussion, I cannot judge so easily.

I greatly doubt Newman's consenting to Wetherell's suggestion, after his clear declaration that he thinks we ought to come to an end. I surely told you of his saying we ought to give in, and should be in a false position, but he never said we should be made to. Our whole correspondence on the subject was founded on the presumption of Antonelli striking a blow either through the Index or the bishops, and he said he thought if that happened we ought not to go on, and should do better to be beforehand with it. I gave him many good reasons for our determination to do neither one nor the other. As to a manifesto, our decision upon this involves that of the question of a declaration of war. I confess I look with nothing but unmitigated horror and alarm at your disposition to take advantage of the change for more vigorous and bitter polemics. (1) Resentment is unworthy of the dignity of a grave and religious magazine. (2) Opposition implies partisanship, which implies partiality and a disposition not to do justice to all aspects of a question, but to stick to that which serves ulterior ends. (3) Besides this erroneous restriction of our own horizon leaves a territory for the enemy to occupy, and gives him an undeserved and powerful position against our shortcomings. (4) The best way to fight authorities is to convert their subjects, and this not by doing battle against power, but for the principles of the *Rambler*. (5) Liberty, truth-

fulness, honesty, and that strict method in discussion which seeks not what is convenient, but what is true, can be recommended with very little effect except by example. This is one of those problems which are solved by walking, not by preaching. Instead of war, I would say to the warriors, *Nolite turbare circulos meos*. Our purpose has in one sense not been a directly practical one. We have never tried to produce an immediate particular effect, or to influence action, except by the slow process of influencing thought, and we have tried to do this by influencing habits of thought, not by imposing opinions. In this course we can best go on by giving examples of what we wish to teach. I wish *toto corde* that you may take in some part of these ideas, and allow them to check, if not to soothe, your just indignation and your native and highly cultivated pugnacity.

If so, you will agree with me that no long explanation is required. False and malicious explanations are sure to be given, and may be contradicted and corrected. But in the *Rambler* itself I would not speak of it. Let us rather print at the beginning a leaf such as Newman adopted. His would require modification. Paragraph 1 must be changed to fit present circumstances; 2 stet; 3 disappears; 4 and 5 remain, also 6, 7 and 8. Then a new paragraph might be added: the *Rambler* goes on as before, regarding as open to free discussion all questions not decided by the authority of the Church, except the purely dogmatic department which Newman excluded; regarding such discussions a necessary *pro* and *con*, in order to instruct and enlighten ourselves on those points which can only be

made clear by discussion, and also as the only means of presenting in their true light Catholic views to those who do not share our faith. I would not say more than this to attract Protestants, lest it appear that we reckon now too much on them. And this leads to another powerful consideration against quarrelling, that we have now, more than we had before, the likelihood of a Protestant public. Their presence will be a useful moral force in certain circumstances, but in general it is not well to wash our dirty linen in public, or to look for witnesses of that domestic occupation. I certainly think we shall possess a more firm independence, and that the importance of our existence increases with the attempts to stop us—attempts not justifiable by any means, and which we must be careful not to provide excuses for. Macmullen is right. Generally I think there is more point in his wit than maturity in his judgement and opinions.

I would not begin with a declaration of our rights and intentions in an article, for they are pretty well known, and a wise number would show that they are not changed. Remember, the change of publisher will be a perplexity to the baffled pursuer, and he will make up for it by saying we ought never to have had a Catholic publisher or appearance, that we have thrown off a transparent mask, etc. It will be grist to his mill if the new number supplies materials to confirm this statement, by going beyond what has been our tone before. Have you made our change of publisher public, as by mentioning it to Northcote? Any review about to be started will look to him, and he will be a powerful influence in it. He is a tactician, and I apprehend now

a passionate adversary. If he writes and muddles in opposition to us, he will be sure to take up anything you fail in by too great wrath and to profit by every opening. I think him—precisely because he is least likely to do harm or to lead the public astray—the most capable of all these men to injure us, if, like unskilful generals, concentrating our forces on one point, we leave an important position unoccupied. It is very easy to take one side in the great Italian question and to write till you are sick about the good Pope and the wicked Ricasoli, or *vice versâ*, strengthening your case with a few generous admissions. But who has looked at both sides, historically regardless of effect and impressions objectively, except ourselves? That is the best position; every temptation to abandon it is a temptation of weakness.

Döllinger's book is not quite all printed yet. I cannot write beginning or end of my article till it is published; but I shall be within the appointed time, and I will send the middle part first. I think I can promise near thirty pages. I have disputed several points unsuccessfully with the Professor; on others, especially political ones, I have been of some use to him, especially, too, with reference to the various feelings and impressions about the world, and I have had a hand in his preface, which is, I think, about the most perfect thing I have ever read. I will translate a good part of it.

Letter XCII

Manning on Papal sovereignty—Origin of Papal Temporal Power—The Pope possibly an exile—The Papacy not national—Some temporal sovereignty necessary for the Pope's freedom—Utterances of the early Popes on the nature of their power—All Catholics hold that the Pope must be free somehow

Munich [*Tuesday, October* 9, 1861].

You are certainly not too severe on Manning's elaborate absurdities.* I had no idea he had gone so far. What must the Pope think of him if he ever knows of all these things? I have jotted down a thought or two on your MS. If this is to be an article of faith, there must be another, that the Pope's subjects will always be Catholic: *Indefectibilitas populi Romani.* I think you are quite right in principle that it is a question of freedom, like everybody else's, which rises in proportion to responsibility *for*, or authority *over*, others, not of government. But the State in which freedom would be sufficiently secured against the government *and* against the people is ideal. England is the only example of the first; but a No Popery cry could be got up in England which would set all rights at defiance in the streets. Practically your theory would require English law and Catholic people, that is the south of Ireland, such a place as I have the honour to represent. But *propter malitiam temporum*, as Bellarmine says, who thinks the Pope would be better without

* In the article, "Dr Manning on the Papal Sovereignty," which appeared in the November number.

temporal power, there is no other way of securing him. You are quite right against Manning's theory, but in point of fact we cannot devise an alternative for sovereignty. It is impossible to exaggerate the danger of such doctrines as his. I wish you would take the line of Catholic indignation a little. As to its not being right to call those bad Catholics who laugh at his absurdities, you speak too apologetically. This is not a safe tone. I would rather go at it in this way: that according to this high theory it is necessary to consider every denier of it a bad Catholic, treating this as a *reductio ad absurdum*, from the absurdity of the theory itself, which necessarily censures all opponents. I showed in my article on the Roman states that the Roman state grew out of immunities, such as abounded in every part of Carolingian State. The Pope was at the head of a great *immunitas*, like many other prelates. The similarity of the two things, Papal and episcopal independence, appears best under Charlemagne.

P.S.—You speak of the danger of schism in a way I should have thought exaggerated, but your notion of the Pope in France is dreadful, for a despotism founded on absolute and infidel democracy is precisely what he must most avoid. Why not suggest the alternative of an English exile? The empire fell in 1806 at the peace of Presburg. Has the Vienna protest of Pius VII anything to do with it? I quite agree with your theory of the empire, and so the popes understood it, but you push too far your view that it is still ideally extant. Pacca thought that its revival by Napoleon might render the temporal power altogether unnecessary. Nicholas I's saying is most apposite:

Observe, with reference to the analogy with all other freedom, that bishops, etc., belong to particular nations, but the Papacy (as representing unity and government of universal Church) is not national. So it is natural that its freedom should be secured in a different way. Consider the case of the State he is in being at war with other Catholic States, and his peril if it is at war with heretical States. The *right* of liberty is a *claim* not always admitted. The Church's right is denied by the pagan State, which denies distinction between religious and civil authority, and by the modern absolute State. The temporal sovereignty is the only plan we can devise to secure liberty for the Pope, but it is a means subsidiary; in fact it is a negative idea, the not being governed, not the right of governing, though governing is the only way to avoid being governed. It is stated as a basis, an acknowledgement of independence, not as a means of defence or a source of political power. The extent therefore is not essential.

I am writing in a great hurry to save the post, having come in late. Has Wetherell seen your paper? He will say, if he has not yet seen it, that a part is not clear to the vulgar. But what strikes me most is the need of modifying the deprecatory or apologetic portion, as if you *were* accused, into the suggestion that on these principles you *might* be accused. Nardi, for whom, for a very good reason, I have a reverence, assures me solemnly that no Peter's Pence go to Naples. Pray take this into consideration. Also a point to be made is that, if the Pope really leaves Rome, then will be the time to help him with all our might and main. Let us therefore not exhaust our poverty when he does

not want it. The Emperor's mind is quite made up. He told Nardi, *Il faut passer une éponge sur tout cela*, meaning the Roman State. Don't quote this, but be sure of the Emperor's determination.

Wednesday [*October* 10, 1861].

I had not time yesterday, but this morning I have been looking in Dupuis's dissertations for utterances of the early Popes on the nature of their power. I daresay where you got the others you have also got these, but I copy them in case you know them not. Perhaps one or two of them may be actually quoted in your article. I did not read it with reference to this, and may have forgotten.

Gelasius (*in tomo de anathematis vinculo*—I have no more exact reference and do not know what it is: it is not necessary for you to quote cap. and verse) "quod si hæc tentare formidant, nec ad suæ pertinere cognoscunt modulum potestatis, cui tantum de humanis rebus judicare permissum est," etc., etc. [After quoting several passages Lord Acton continues:] If any of these passages are new to you, I hope they may be of use against Manning. Observe that there are authorities opposed to all these in the middle ages. You wot of them in the books you had of mine: e.g., in Giesler. But this later theory not only never was realized, but the attempt to carry it out was the cause of the decline of the papal power in Europe after Boniface VIII. If it failed in those days when the clergy had still such a supremacy of knowledge, how much more now. It is a theory which is explicable from the state of things and aspirations in a particular age, and only deserves conside-

ration viewed in the light of that age historically, conditionally. Then as the other theory is just as distinctly defined by equal authorities, and is the only one that ever stood the test of facts and the light of day, there is certainly no presumption of religiousness in favour of Manning's views. It ruined the Popes once; what will it do now? Even if true speculatively, which we deny—but let us admit for argument sake—seeing the effect it must have on Protestants, and on the vast majority of all Catholics, especially of Catholic scholars who deny it, and the use enemies can make of it against us, all reasons of expedience would lead us not to put it forward, as it *can* do no practical good and must do much harm. The other, the common faith of Catholics, that the Pope must be free by hook or by crook, is obviously enough for us practically."

Shall you have Guizot's book in time for a short notice? It will be excellent of its kind. At this distance I shall be too late.

Letter XCIII

Change of publishers—Proper way to make this public—The Roman Question the great source of hostility—Possibility of the Pope having to go into exile—Döllinger's book

Munich, Thursday [*October* 11, 1861].

I am not surprised at Newman's fighting shy; but I am getting anxious to know the result of your letter to Northcote. I hope you have agreed to advertise largely and to take advertisements, and to push in America. . .

As to publishing my name I do not know what good

it can do and should have under ordinary circumstances strong objections. As things now stand, I do not care about it. One or two changes in the advertisement occurred to me: *just* claims are indefinite; *necessary* implies that we must follow in the wake of modern advancement. *Implicit* faith is a bad expression of Newman's, for it is a theological term applied to those truths which cannot be made clear to reason. If we use the words, "submission to the authority of an infallible Church," or "tribunal," or "to infallible authority," it implies that we submit where the authority is infallible, but hold ourselves free where it is not, and when it is not, for instance, the Index or the bishops. How say you? I cannot make out why the change of publishers obliges us to give an account of ourselves. Autobiographical notices in a review seem to me altogether out of taste. Burns will presently appear as publisher of another periodical. This will be significant enough. . . I see in the *Union* that it is rumoured that the *Rambler* is to change hands, certain expressions having given offence in high quarters. Will it not be enough to say simply that in consequence of a difference of opinion with our former publisher we are compelled to seek a new one?* I think this sort of reserve would look more simple and would be more ingenious, for whatever our coming troubles, which I do not underrate, nobody can be so blind as not to see that this move disengages us from the awkwardness and annoyance of disputes with authority. Any full explanation must make it definitely clear that we are at variance with the powers that be, which, without

* This is practically what was done in the note printed at the end of the November number.

further details, raises a presumption against us. That notion ought not to be cultivated. The time cannot be distant when the great source of hostility to us, the Roman question, will be solved for a time in a way which will be a confirmation of our views. Then the quarrel between us and the Roman party will have no interest, for we shall be as zealous as any in support of the dispossessed and fugitive Pope. If, on the other hand, he makes terms, which in his late allocution he implies in vague terms that he will never do, in spite of Passaglia, actor and mediator, I suppose we shall find ourselves more popish than the Pope, and shall defend the Church against an iniquitous league between Antonelli and the Piedmontese. Do not let us commit ourselves in such a way as will prevent us soon from taking up either of these very advantageous positions. Acknowledged and organized opposition would so commit us, I think at least. Of course, with the Pope in Bavaria our antagonism on the ground of freedom of inquiry will remain, though a German exile will soon effect a change even in this respect. I do not think it wise either to display a great sense of the importance we attach to the charge or to the grievance which led to it. I give my voice, at any rate, for nothing more than a colourless notice to correspondents, reserving our fire for the reply; unless a word or two of explanation are put into the sort of manifesto which I think ought to be adopted and adapted from Newman's in 1859.

I shall send you by to-morrow's post ten pages of MS.*—less than a third of my article—the rest in the course of the week. Several sheets of the book are not

* On Döllinger's new book.

yet ready. I have insinuated a good deal of unmitigated whiggism into the Professor's book; but otherwise there are lots of refined gold in it. I wish we could have Guizot and Passaglia at the same time. Eckstein is preparing to discuss the Professor as soon as he appears, I suppose in the *Correspondant*.

Letter XCIV

Sends his review of Döllinger—At the end has put the moral in a *résumé* of his own

Munich, October 16 [1861].

I hope no news is good news, and that you are going on with a propitious wind. I am off on Friday for Leipzig and Berlin, at which capital a letter, *poste restante*, will reach me any time before the end of the next week.

Deluded partly by your want of copy, partly by forgetfulness that I was writing on both sides of my paper, I have made my article a monster. The variety of the subjects, as well as their interest, would be an excuse if the article corresponded to those qualities; but the best is to come. I daresay you have judiciously clipped the first portion of MS. I hope to get the sheets of the preface to-night, and then all that remains can be posted on Friday and will reach you on Monday. A quotation (p. 47) from Psalm lxxiv, 6, does not suit the passage in the Douai translation. I have not the English version at hand, and do not know whether it would be an improvement. At the end I have pointed the moral in a *résumé* of my own, translating the Professor more com-

pletely into the language of the *Rambler*. You will find lots of things that will delight you.

Letter XCV

Suggests to Simpson an article on the life of Tocqueville—He should be compared with other Frenchmen and with Burke

Buckland [*Friday*, *Nov.* 8, 1861].

I have just seen the English edition of the life of Tocqueville, which is fuller than the French, which you have got. It will be a capital subject for an article by you in the next number. I will send you desultory notes, if you care for them.

To describe what formed his mind and how it grew in power and how it developed in its views from American democracy to his last work, in which he stands in opposition to modern popular ideas far more than at first sight people suppose.

Then to compare him to other Frenchmen—to show the very distinct limits and the very broad gaps of his genius and of his knowledge—how he occupies nearly the position of Burke to his own countrymen, minus the greatness and vastness of the other's mind, but plus much colder observation. You will make a capital article if you will get the new book from Mudie. Pray send a line to Aldenham to say whether it is worth while to send you notes.

I shall have a political article ready. I have just found Goldwin Smith's *Ireland*, and will jot down notes for a review in case you get no Irishman to do it.

I have Mrs Bastard's article.* We must have a notice of Miss Porter; shall I ask Oxenham?

I would write more if I only had a better pen.

Letter XCVI

Approves Simpson's scheme for a paper on Tocqueville—Future of the Catholic Church in America—Newman seems to have forgotten "his wish to see the *Rambler* extinct"

Aldenham, Sunday [*Nov.* 10, 1861].

Your scheme for a paper on Tocqueville is excellent. I will send what notes I can, but apprehend they will be useless and placeless, for you may answer what Pirou said of Voltaire: *Il travaille en marqueterie, et moi je jette en bronze.* But the development of his religious ideas ought certainly not to be overlooked. See the chapter on the Catholic Church, her future in America; and that on the French clergy before the Revolution (a very poor chapter); also letters to Mme Swetchine about 1856. I have not got the life; I only saw it at Buckland. I shall send you Mrs Bastard for Wetherell, who is accustomed to cook her style. I think Oxenham has not seen—to judge from the fragment you send me—the *portée* of Goldwin Smith's book, especially of its errors. Do you know whether the signature T. C. is known, or whether I could erect it into our Irish historical contributor? De Vere did not know it, nor disapproved the article, though not poetical enough.

Pray get Stokes to go on with the same subject, if he has more to say about it; but his views on the new Minute ought to appear in January, before the meet-

* "Rio on Christian Art," which appeared in January, 1862.

ing of Parliament. Ffoulkes writes to ask me for literary employment. Do you mind my asking him for certain articles? He can surely be of use, and we ought not to throw away a chance. De Vere is off on eastern travel. Green has taken up with glee your idea, and will do what you propose. I hardly thought the Milnerian tradition would so easily lapse into Ramblerism. I have heard abominable nonsense quoted from Broglie's article, which I have not seen. I think you are right about co-operation, but wrong in identifying them with secret societies. Pray bring to bear upon your political speculations the distinction between State and society (unknown to the ancients, due to Christianity).

Newman seems to have forgotten his wish to see us extinct, and speaks quite freely of our future prospects. Also he likes the last number; especially your article on Manning.

Letter XCVII

The Church wants freedom from corporations—The medieval theory —In politics the Church need not seek her own ends—Some some suggested topics for articles

Aldenham, Tuesday [*November* 12, 1861].

All you say is perfectly true, and the connexion between the absolutist tendencies of the Church and the establishment of the Roman monarchy is very important and not understood. I wanted to write an article on Julius II, and another on Leo X which would have explained this, but I have collected such heaps of materials that I don't know when I shall master them. True it is that what the Church wants is freedom for

corporations. What she had in the middle ages was the erection of corporations into political bodies—a necessary result in a society where political power followed property, and all property was real. The immunity she then obtained was only a phase of the medieval theory of self-government—the battle between which and feudalism is the political topic of medieval history. In modern times she can only demand the self-government due to every legitimate association. The distinction between these and secret societies is that the former are for social, private purposes, the latter for influence in the State. Whether or no the Church overlooked this difference in condemning associations that easily assumed a revolutionary aspect, I know not, but you probably know it. Only do not let us make the same mistake.

In politics as in science the Church need not seek her own ends. She will obtain them if she encourages the pursuit of the ends of science, which are truth, and of the State, which are liberty. We ought to learn from mathematics fidelity to the principle and the method of inquiry and of government.

In the next "Current Events" we must deal with the French treatment of the Society of St Vincent. Pray note whatever analogy or illustration the Roman practice supplies. What would be the rule there?

I have suggested a topic to Ffoulkes: Innocent XI requesting James II to intercede with Lewis XIV to stop the persecution of the Huguenots. I cannot find that his letter has ever been published. I showed Döllinger what there is in print about it, and he quotes it in his preface. Do you know anything about it?

Ffoulkes wrote, I think, about Innocent and the Revolution, about which there is much to say.

The house is full of people. Green borrowed yesterday no less than eight folios, in pursuance of his engagement.

Letter XCVIII

Natural sciences and religion—The real questions are such as creation, the existence of a spiritual world, etc.—Articles for the next number of the *Rambler*

Aldenham, Monday [*Nov.* 18, 1861].

I am distraught by a house full of people and write in a hurry. I cannot at this moment lay my hand on your printed letter. My impression on reading it was that it was only a good argument if we take a Protestant, or, if you like, a Roman view of Scripture. It seems to me that natural science hardly ever gets at religion by itself without the help of moral sciences, metaphysics, etc. The real questions are not concerning Moses or Joshua, but creation, the existence of a spiritual world, the unity of mankind. To discuss the way modern science touches these points I wanted to brush up my ignorance of that sort of literature, if I had time, as I shall never have a better opportunity to learn something about it. As this is not done, I cannot say what I should have to say in reply.

Then of course I meant to reiterate the doctrine that disinterested science and faith cannot be contradictory, that they clash only by the fault of the professors of one or the other, or from imperfect knowledge, etc.

I will do everything in my power for Wetherell, now that I am not afraid of annoying him. Ffoulkes will I hope find the text of Innocent's letter to James, which will be interesting. Also your letter and Green's, who is full of points and much excited. He goes to Conference to-morrow, and I hope will not leak and be stopped. Then "Campion" and "Tocqueville," "Rio," Stokes, Oxenham on poets. If I live and do well, I shall have two articles.

Letter XCIX

Difficulty of writing short literary notices—The pains taken in reading a book too great for a few lines of notice—Serious books are unfit for a ten line review

Aldenham, Wednesday [*Nov.* 20, 1861].

I will write to encourage Stokes. If the truth is to fly from the *Rambler*, I do not know what will become of it.

I agree with Wetherell about Guizot, whose book I had only for twenty minutes in hand. One or two points are suggested by the article in the *Saturday* three weeks ago. Also his praise of the Reformation for two things, neither spiritual and both false, ought to be used against him. Altogether the book seemed to me full of truisms, commonplaces and generalities. Likewise I dislike Wetherell's notion of literary notices for this reason, that if you read a book that is good you must find a great deal to say about it which will not go into a third of a page; and if you have not read enough for that, it is very perilous writing about it at all. I should always feel very uneasy if I wrote

that kind of notice either of injustice to the writer or of being exposed by a more careful reader. The pains one takes in reading a book sufficiently to review it are too great for such a small result as a few lines, and are too great to allow of one's doing well a large number of publications. My own plan would rather be to notice at one to three pages all books which suggest remarks on their *subjects*, or give an opportunity for making them and make one read in a number of other books for what one wants in order to be confident. Pray consider and discuss these opposite views. Add also that a serious book (Guizot, Goldwin Smith and Co.) is unfit for ten lines and cannot always have an article. A notice of two or three pages is often enough to satisfy its requirement. The *Westminster's* critiques and my friend Menzel's *Literaturblatt* are my models. The altogether contemptuous epigrams which, as you say, my soul loveth belong only to books altogether beside the mark or behind the age, which don't deserve to be treated seriously or like grown up people.

If we can fill next number without both my articles, it will be well, as I shall have my provision for use when I have no time to write.

Letter C

Criticism of Simpson's "Tocqueville's Remains"—Democracy one of three or four elements in the State—Tocqueville's picture of America accurate—The proper function of the historian—The proper use of history—True notion of liberty; an acquisition not a gift—What the restoration of the Pope would imply

Aldenham, Saturday [*November* 23, 1861].

I have only just begun your article,* and I take up my pen to put down remarks as they suggest themselves.

E.g. The notion that freedom must be reconciled with two great, inevitable powers apparently hostile to it, democracy and religion, is capital. It will bear, I think, more definite development in your text. He discovered the importance and danger of the first sooner than the other. You say very rightly that he was no historian, though he wrote the best book on a great historical event, because he could not see things in them flow *im Werden*, as the Germans say, but was a great observer of what is actual or constant, like the dealers in physical science. Is not the great delusion of his America the belief in the irresistible progress of democracy to predominance through all history? In reality democracy is a part, one of three (or four) elements in the State, which in early undeveloped societies has no place at all, which it is the business of history to raise to its proper level and proportion, and the effort of the revolution to make sole and supreme. The solution

* The article for the January *Rambler* on "Tocqueville's Remains."

is in self-government with indifference of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, all which Plato and Aristotle very well knew. His picture of America is perfectly accurate, not simply by supererogation, but because his powers of observing were far beyond his powers of reasoning. He says in the passage you quote (p. 10), "I endeavoured to show *that*," etc., a vicious locution in the mouth of a historian whose business it is to show *what* was or happened, not *that* any particular thing is or was.

Observe that America has not solved the problem of reconciling democracy with freedom, for it has not reconciled power with law, or will with duty, which is the moral aspect of the same thing.

P. 13 on the use of history is excellent. As to his originality he is nearly right. *Research* should be original; but a man who disdains what others have said either goes wrong or ends by saying what others have said without knowing it. In his *America* he does knowingly say much that others had discovered before him, without acknowledgement. In my American article I quoted Story's complaint to that effect. In the other book his leading conclusions, ideas, judgements and much of his facts had been anticipated in the introduction to the history of the revolutionary period by Heinrich von Sybel, which appeared (vol. 1) at Düsseldorf in 1853 (the preface is dated May 8, 1853). This anticipation of so great a book I hold to be one of the most remarkable things in literature. Sybel is an excellent historian but a complete unbeliever.

(P. 17, first lines). There is a fallacy in his notion of liberty as compared to religion. Liberty is not a gift,

but an acquisition; not a state of rest, but of effort and of growth; not a starting point, but a result of government; or at least a starting point only as an object—not a *datum*, but an aim. Just as the regular movements of the heavenly bodies produce (?) the music of the spheres, liberty is the result of the principle *suum cuique* in action. What you said of a bore is true of freedom (see vol. II, p. 217—one of the very best paragraphs you ever wrote). *Pray* consider this analogy. The word *Religion* is too indefinite—only truths come true; and only the true religion corresponds with the truth in politics. Else there is sure to be a creak somewhere in the harmony.

(P. 15). His long passage on religion implies that he has not separated State and Society. What he says immediately after shows the outward differences, but not that of principle and definition.

(P. 22). The words about Germany are so true that after 1848 the whole country clergy in Germany, so far as they were rationalists, all those unbelievers therefore who—unlike the university professors—lived in close intercourse with the people and saw the effect of irreligion on society in a revolution, became believing Protestants and made a great reaction everywhere.

The last words in p. 22 are wrong. If the Austrians had marched against Rome, there would have been no regular defence. They resisted a republic because they relied on a disturbance in Paris. If you like to say this in a note, I can be your surety.

(P. 23, line 5, etc.) Observe that if the Powers restore the Pope, they have a right to demand a security against new revolutions in the concession of liberal insti-

tutions. They cannot always keep up the police or have the necessity of an expedition impending. Secondly, this right is the solution of the difficulty as to the right of the Roman people to revolt. The Romans have a right to demand of the restoring Powers that the restoration shall be conditional—that they may not be again placed in the dilemma between the religious interests of the world and their own political rights—that there may be no provocation of a rebellion against the Pope. The Powers have clearly no right to restore the Pope for the sake of religion unless they restore freedom for the sake of the people. The two things correspond—otherwise the Romans would be worse off than other people because of the Pope, instead of which they ought to have a greater security for freedom than all others, as their sovereign has a greater security for stability. Is it not so?

Nothing can be taken from your paper. The peroration might start from his belief in democracy, which led him at last to set himself against his countrymen—showing that modern France, professing freedom, has but exaggerated the worst evils of the old *régime*, State absolutism and absence of self-government. His historical induction is scanty, and this led him to mistake the progress of society. His book is really a protest against all that inspires modern Europe in Latin countries.

Letter CI

Burke and Tocqueville—Provision for reviews of current literature—Encourages Simpson to write an article on liberty—Sketch of the growth of the idea in Europe—The Crusades—The position of the State in Roman law—The Church against feudal absolutism—All liberty conditional

Aldenham, Tuesday [*Nov.* 26, 1861].

There is not enough resemblance for a comparison between Burke and Tocqueville, except that they were the first political writers of their respective countries, and that both were ludicrously particular about their style. I don't think a comparison would be fruitful.

Pray tell Capes that as far as I am concerned I shall be delighted at his offer, and will undertake his ten guinea subscription at Mudie's together with any remuneration you may agree upon with him. I do not stick to my theory absolutely, except for myself; what I want to exclude is mere literary criticism, where no truths, moral or political, come to light, and for which any journal is competent and the doctrines of the *Rambler* supply no light. If Capes reviews the chief publications of the day and his notices pass through our three pair of hands, they ought to be good for something.

I sent your MS. and Sybel to be posted in London. History does not stand still for twenty years, and Sybel's literature of the First Crusade needs to be greatly modified now. What does Lady D. G. mean by his History of the Crusaders? He delivered two splendid lectures upon them at Munich, in which he absolutely ignores

the religious character of the Hildebrandine age; also a history of the Second Crusade in Schmidt's *Zeitschrift*, which is sound as far as criticism goes. Which has she used?

Your notion about an article on Liberty is worth developing. But we must distinguish nations, or at least civilizations. Antiquity is not involved in the process to which we belong; it influenced it, but is itself quite separate. Our State begins with conquest, at the great Immigration. (Feudalism is the common type of States founded on conquest, even in India, though there it is crossed by castles, which represent permanence in opposition to progress; that is to say, the Pantheistic notion of the state, which is without history.) No European polity has been able to stand without feudalism. Poland never got ordered; Russia is called for this reason an Asiatic State. Hungary was founded on conquest, by a people not Teutonic, but yet Indo-Germanic, which therefore at once adopted Teutonic forms (St Stephen). The State is only ideally the original form of the social life. Each particular State only gradually grew to be a power over the people. At first society was broken into pieces, *self-sufficient;* every group (not every man) for itself, and only God for all. There was no notion of sovereignty; the feudal lord was the highest authority. Hence feuds between them—the token of feudal life—the assumption of functions now devolved on the State, then discharged by every man for himself. This is one instance of the State not existing above society. It is the same in taxation: all local, none imperial, etc.

Consider the Crusades: In the First Crusade you

would suppose that there was no such thing as a State in Europe—no authority above all these noble lords. What we now call the king was in those days a noble among other nobles, not interfering in their sphere and domain, except by feud, not by authority, possessing power, like each of them, only over his own dependents. (France in eleventh century the best instance.) The Aragonese said to their king: "We, each of whom is as good as you, all together better than you." Of course all this was obnoxious to the Church, for she had no room for her grand institution in a society so broken up. Besides, the development of the State is the business of profane history. But stick to this: that in that society out of which modern European States have grown, the corporation was the first thing, the sovereign State the second. But the State gradually gained ground, and took into its hands what was common to all. The Church accomplished the first by borrowing from the Jews the notion of an anointed king, thus elevating by a divine sanction a power which the then society could not develop out of itself.

Afterwards came Roman law (about the time of Frederic I) in which the State is the first thing; law comes downwards from the sovereign, does not grow upward from the people, as in the Teutonic State. This difference is not, however, in the original principle of the two legislations, but in this that the Roman law, which began to be studied, was that of a finished State, of a mature, yea an old people, of an empire that had developed the most extremest absolutism on the ruins of the *Populus*. The political ideas of the Theodorian or Justinian code are those of a society

ground to atoms by the wheel of revolution, consisting no longer of parts, but like sand or water, in which all life and all power are in the sovereign. This is the very opposite extreme of that society to which this system was introduced. Hence Frederic found men at Bologna who told him that all the property of the people was his and that he might take what he liked, that what he left was a concession on his part. As with property so with liberty. The Germans were slow in realizing the State, so the legists clapped a pair of spectacles on their young noses, taught them to lean on a stick and to have the ills of ages. So they grievously overshot the mark, and introduced a dualism into European politics which went on increasing till now we stand alone on Teutonic ground. Italy follows Celto-Roman France and 1789, and in Austria the two principles are at war.

Now the Church was at once attacked by this new power, under Philip the Fair and Nogaret. This was no longer a war against feudal absolutism, as with Hildebrand, Anselm, Becket, but against the pagan State. "Quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem." To this enemy the Church gradually succumbed after Boniface VIII, himself a lawyer, until she fell prostrate in the concordat of Leo X. She had invoked the same absolutism for herself (in the *Unam Sanctam*). So completely had she become estranged from the Teutonic system that all scholastic writers from S. Thomas to Suarez, or even to Taparelli, entirely ignore it. All their ideas are either from Roman law or from Aristotle, or from the Jewish theocracy. So they did unspeakable harm. The evil was that the learned edu-

cation in the middle ages was turned away from actual life to books written in a very different society. See John of Salisbury's account of his studies and his dreadful doctrines. The scholar did not drink of the ideas of the lay society of his time. Later on the Jesuits showed the same estrangement from the State in which they lived.

I don't know what you mean by the freedom of the State. All liberty is conditional, limited, and therefore unequal. The State never can do what it likes in its own sphere. It is bound by all kinds of law. But I must stop my unintelligible rhapsody till you provoke it again.

Ricasoli's paper much occupies my thoughts. I hear Döllinger's book is triumphing in Germany.

Read the 27th book of Montesquieu.

Letter CII

The function of the State—Ultramontanism—Distinction between States and Corporations—The Catholic "Academy"

Aldenham [*Thursday, November* 28, 1861].

I don't think Capes was greatly inspired when he wrote this. His view of the function of the State is so low and material that I can by no means accept it, and fear that if his paper is editorial it will be in contradiction with later articles. Much of it is safe enough, for we have said it often before. Not only Pius IX's but Lord Palmerston's mortality is irrelevant and ungracious. What he wants for a start he gets just as well from Palma Vecchio's position as from the hypothesis

of his death. Then I must protest against the distinction between ultramontane and historical. Everything systematic is anti-historical. Ultramontanism, as it used to be understood, is now a superstition. It means in reality something very different. For my part I believe myself just as much an ultramontanist as a partisan of the historical school.

I told Oxenham we could not promise room both for his article and his letter, and that the letter must be historical, not controversial. I suspect he has given up his article, for though he writes an illegible letter to me every other day he says nothing about it.

What you most want for your theory of liberty is a definition of corporations, and then the constant distinction between States founded on corporations—where they are therefore political—and States which tolerate corporations in the social department, but which are not founded on them.

Your account of the Academy * is charming. I hope Ward's papers will be printed. My friend Lord Petre must have looked rather foolish. Do not superfluously imitate the Cardinal. By an egregious breach of faith he has never submitted for discussion the code of laws which it was agreed in July to introduce, and if he is riled or frightened at first, he will do any foolish and absurd things to save his propriety.

I go to Birmingham on Monday, partly attracted by fat swine, partly by a bazaar to which I gave an incautious promise of appearance. You had better print Tocqueville at once as the first article. I am asked to

* The Catholic literary society founded by Cardinal Wiseman and affiliated to the Roman Academy.

lecture at Bridgnorth, perhaps on America. If I do, I think I shall publish it with notes, which will take time. Will Capes begin his notices this time?

Letter CIII

Simpson's letter against Manning—Difference between doctrine and discipline—The claims of the Church are founded on her institutions, not on her history

Aldenham, Tuesday [*Dec.* 1, 1861].

Your letter * is not too strong. I have softened only one passage and struck out what you wrote over the page, because I was not sure *Clericis laicos* was revoked, and feared that as you had just written Urban for Boniface you might have made an oversight. But if you wrote cautiously, pray restore the words.

Does not Manning know the difference between doctrine and discipline? The analogy is with such things as the authority over princes in the middle ages, which was definite, conditional, and therefore local and temporary. I dare say Manning would wish to erect that power into a theory and an absolute right as Brownson did. In Rocaberti he must have found so many who did so, and so much nonsense of every kind, that he may well have been seduced into his present errors. I was once very familiar with that dreadful compilation. All those men believed that what was right once was right always—that the claims of the Church came from her nature, not from her position—from her institution, not from her her history.

* A letter against Dr Manning which was afterwards cancelled.

This they believed even in matters of doctrine where they admitted no development. In discipline they were therefore naturally absolutists.

Your view of the politics of the day I think perfectly right. But it will discourage Capes if we reject his article. Cannot we put it into the second part? I know nothing of a political article professedly; but I will make the review of Goldwin Smith * editorial, and cram it with doctrine. Then Tocqueville, Stokes and Smith will be in the first part—Campion, Mrs Bastard, Capes, Oxenham in the second. I shall see the last to-morrow and learn about his contribution.

Surely the only purpose of the Americans was to insult and defy England. It must be a horrible mess for the Government.

By the by, I have not been reckoning on your paper on "Liberty." Will it be ready in time? That would be excellent.

Letter CIV

Articles for the *Rambler*—Newman is not well—Sends some notices of books by Capes—The great merit of Dickens as a pure writer

Aldenham, Tuesday [*December* 3, 1861].

By all means give more of Burton and work out your points. It will make a very interesting notice. Green is hard at work and promises to be ready this week. Oxenham will send an article and letter in a few days. Goldwin Smith will be done this week and will be near twenty pages.

I wasted my substance at Birmingham yesterday.

* Mr Goldwin Smith's *Irish History*, which appeared in January, 1862.

Northcote and others were pleased to be gracious. The head of a pious family, leaders of *ton* in the town, told me that because they stuck to the Oratory, near which they live, they are snubbed by the other good people of the place.

Newman is very seedy and never shows or does anything in public. He is always going to London to consult doctors, and, I am afraid, thinks himself in a bad way. Flanagan, I found, the historian, is a tremendous oracle of the Birmingham clergy.

I hear there is very little chance of our escaping war. A thousand apologies about *Clericis laicos*. You are quite right. I only remembered the revocation of *Unam Sanctam*. Do not forget that Clement V was not the immediate successor of Boniface VIII, Boniface IX intervened.

Wednesday.

I forwarded by to-day's post some of Capes' notices, which seem to me very much the thing. Pray don't let them print *naïve*, which is feminine; *naïf* is the word. Also a passage about natural theology I leave to your severer judgement. I do not think Dickens' general character ought ever to be touched upon without noticing the great merit that in all his books there is no indecency. Pickwick, moreover, is not so decidedly his best book as to deserve to be always referred to as such. Nancy's refusal to be delivered from Sikes after her love for the child had brought her chance of redemption, and Charley Bates turning against the murderer, are surely in higher style than anything in Pickwick.

Here is Oxenham's letter; not bad, I think. Did I

tell you that his poetry was to include several recent works, especially Edwin of Deira, which he says is excellent?

Letter CV

Morality of opening letters—Montalembert on Döllinger's book—The great success of the work—Sudden death of Eckstein

Aldenham, Friday [*Dec.* 6, 1861].

I forgot to write about a passage, I think in your notice of Burton, about opening letters. Graham was attacked because he did it for a foreign power, but the Government considers itself justified in doing it when there is a rebellion against the Queen. Meagher has a sister, a nun, at Princethorpe. All her letters were opened when they were in pursuit of the brother.

It is a singular confirmation of what I said in my article that Montalembert should write of Döllinger's book: "J'en signerais volontiers chaque parole." For what he goes to say he is no great authority: "J'estime qu'il n'a rien été fait de plus fort depuis Bossuet contre la réforme et ses conséquences."

The success of the book is very different to what I expected. Eight thousand copies have been sold in six weeks. The great majority both of the clergy and laity in Germany have adopted it. The Archbishop of Munich has wished Döllinger joy, declared his entire approval, and his fear that the Court of Rome will do itself great harm by censuring it. For my part I do not see how they can protect the *Civiltà* and at the same tolerate Döllinger. A French translation is coming out; I fear by a very incompetent man.

With a view to a new edition I have sent Döllinger my own criticisms. I am anxious to see how he will take them.

You know of Eckstein's sudden death. He was near eighty. It has been a fatal year for eminent Catholics.

Letter CVI

Oxenham as a disputant—A passage in an article by Stokes should be changed—Accents in Latin are barbarous—His analysis of Döllinger—Recent novel literature the great glory in literature—The religion of the modern novelist is natural religion

Aldenham, Sunday night [*December* 8, 1861].

. . . I told Oxenham that I could not promise room for letter and article. If you decide against the first, Wetherell had better tell him so. He is quite interminable as a disputant, in private as well as in print. But I thought it a very good letter.

One passage in Stokes that I have remarked upon ought to be changed. It will not only offend, but will do harm instead of good. Our prudent colleague will, I am sure, agree with me and you also. There is nothing else that I wish to alter except the Latin accents, which are as barbarous as the absence of accents in Greek; but I cannot correct so good a scholar. It ought to come after your Tocqueville, so that our two *reviews* may not come together. Business has interrupted my work, but "Goldwin Smith" will be done in a few days. Green is only behindhand because I have flooded his house with literary resources. Burke and I are old friends. I hope when Lent comes he will absolve me. Advent is not severe enough. Do you see the difference between

the effects of fear and of anger in the distinction he makes? I certainly did not betray my disagreement with Döllinger on the question of the restoration, the subject of long discussions between us. At Edgbaston they have his book and think I made it much too soft. If these people think they agree with Döllinger, I have been a very skilful analyst.

I shall try and find out about Eckstein's paper. I believe he wrote rapidly and suddenly. If you cook Dickens, do it with your own sauce, not with mine. In spite of your dislike of novels, you must have read his older works. Our recent novel literature seems to me to be our great glory in literature since Bulwer's reformation. They are nearly all respectable except Currer Bell and Kingsley—but at least the masters, Neo-Bulwer, Thackeray, Dickens, Reade, Trollope. The corrupt Bulwer was in the ascendant, then Boz appeared, which is much to the credit of the latter. Certain Germans of the last century remind me of him as to religion. They saw "no divine part of Christianity," but divinified humanity, or humanized religion, and taught that man was perfectible, but childhood perfect. So they used to die full of benevolence and admiration of the sun and moon, and for their children and their dog and for their home. They hated intolerance, exclusiveness, positive religion, and with a comprehensive charity embraced all mankind and condemned alike differences of faith and distinctions of rank, as insurrection against the broad, common humanity. Their religion was a sort of natural religion adorned with poetry and enthusiasm—quite above Christianity. Herder was a man of this stamp. Surely Dickens is very like them. Nothing can be more

indefinite than his religion, or more human. He loves his neighbour for his neighbour's sake, and knows nothing of sin when it is not crime. Of course this shuts out half of psychology from his sight and partly explains that he has so few characters and so many caricatures. His humour, I take it, is only the second cause of his caricaturing, and has found its grave in it. I really cannot see the fun of describing a man by an absurdity, by his always sucking his forefinger, or having a mouth like a letter-box, or firing a gun at sundown. It is mere poverty of imagination. His habit of taking a particular newspaper or other incidents and personages into his books is a sign of the same failing. A poet describes something more general than a particular character. Is it more than mere Protestantism that all his deaths should be without spiritual assistance?

Has anyone reviewed Guizot? If not, Oxenham is ready to do it, having just read him. Pray let me know as soon as you can. What he says to me about it is perfectly right. I wish there was a good report of Ferrari's speech. He is the most profound historian in Italy, as Massari is about the most accomplished scholar. Have you read his preface to Gioberti?

You have miscalculated the quantity from your inclination to exclude: Tocqueville, 22; Stokes, 17; Acton, 28; Campion, 23; Capes, 8; Mrs N. Bastard, 10; Oxenham, 12; your letter, 3; Green, 7; Notices, 12; Current Events, 2; total, 144.

Letter CVII

Morality of persecution—Recommends Guerra's work on Papal constitutions—An apology of the Reign of Terror—Goldwin Smith's errors—Döllinger is writing about Eckstein

Aldenham, Friday [*December* 13, 1861].

Oxenham's poetical criticism is sometimes commonplace, but we want something of the kind as a literary relief from so much gravity. It ought to come between Stokes and me, I think.* At any rate, criticism of taste must be editorial.

In his notice of Guizot was a passage which would have made us obnoxious to the Index. To say that persecution is wrong, nakedly, seems to me first of all untrue, but at the same time it is in contradiction with solemn decrees, with Leo X's Bull against Luther, with a Breve of Benedict XIV of 1748, and with one of Pius VI of 1791.

I have gone into the history of these ideas *à propos* of Goldwin Smith in order to be able to speak quite confidently. I have collected such lots of materials that I must use them in a separate paper. This is what has delayed me for the last few days. . .

Saturday [*December* 14].

There is an invaluable book which you ought to devote a day to at the Museum: Guerra, *Constitutiones Pontificiæ*, 4 vols, folio, 1772, with an index rich enough to make your mouth water. It gives under

* This piece, from the pen of Oxenham, was not printed.

distinct heads all that the Popes have written, decreed or decided upon, giving the substance of the document, often the very words of the essential portions, together with references.

Sunday [*December* 15].

I send you a paper in which I hope a certain tone of *Dominus vobiscum* will disguise various ideas which are not of the most acceptable kind. An apology of the Reign of Terror has, compared to many Catholic apologies, the advantage of entire sincerity and truth, and serves to show that we defend the Church on the same footing as all other truths.

I am softened towards all Goldwin Smith's errors by his purposelessness and honesty. He often speaks of things he does not know, but is not really a humbug in history. I have not felt confidence enough to use your paper on his other book, as I have not read it. If it throws any light on his want of the sense of the spiritual, pray put it in at the place where I say that of him.

Who is Manwaring, of King William Street, by whom a translation of the Professor's is announced? Döllinger is writing a life of Eckstein to be prefixed to a posthumous work of his.

Letter CVIII

Goldwin Smith's "Irish History"—Döllinger's treatment of positive Protestantism—The Society of St Vincent de Paul—Only such societies can intercept poverty on its way to pauperism—Indiscriminate almsgiving—Death of Prince Albert

Aldenham, Tuesday [*December* 17, 1861].

I reckon upon your longanimity to make my paper intelligible* and to correct what you disapprove. Bramhall had better be left out. The words of G[oldwin] S[mith] startled me, impressed with Laud's mediocrity and with the conspicuous failure of his enterprise.

I must confess that if you deprive G. S. of his honesty in history, he has nothing to stand upon but the merits of his style. But his blunders are certainly not due to his theory, if he has one, or he would not make out so weak a case against the Irish establishment. However, I cannot speak as to his other book, and must leave that correction to you. In the passage about laws you are right as to the meaning, but do averages signify all that recurs with constant regularity? I want to distinguish between injunctions proceeding from outward authority and will, and laws which are part of a thing's nature.

I can hardly conceive a real infidel translating all Döllinger's book faithfully, but there is not a word in it against the infidels, and it is remarkable that the Professor should have particularly reckoned on his treatment of positive Protestantism being taken up and

* "Mr Goldwin Smith's Irish History," ibid. pp. 190-220.

pushed forward by unattached Protestants. Strange that his Italian translator should have been, on a former occasion, Bianchi Giovini, no better than Manning, according to your account of him.

Be sure not to mitigate the folly and wickedness of suppressing St Vincent, while you explain it. The beauty of the Society always struck me with being in harmony with the laws of political economy. The remedy for poverty is not in the material resources of the rich, but in the moral resources of the poor. These, which are lulled and deadened by money gifts, can be raised and strengthened only by personal influence, sympathy, charity. Money gifts save the poor man who gets them, but give longer life to pauperism in the country. Moral influence cuts off the supplies which nourish it. Only institutions like the St Vincent Society can intercept poverty on its way to pauperism, and can permanently relieve not only the poor but the State. For poverty comes either from one's own fault, or from some independent cause. The first may be prevented by influences over which the State has no power, by social action, which reduces poverty to its ideal minimum of those who are poor by no fault of their own and who have a claim on the State. These alone, in whose case compassion is free from censure, are to be directly supported by the public. Indiscriminate almsgiving is as contrary to Christ's teaching as to political science. A despotic State founded on proletariate naturally jealous of influences coming between it and the basis of its construction.

The Prince is a serious loss,* but he only misled our

* i.e., Prince Albert, Consort of the Queen.

public men in German affairs. As the Prince of Wales comes to the van, I suppose it will strengthen his candidate, the Duke of Newcastle, who is also Goldwin Smith's patron. Probably the Queen will be more disposed to follow her feelings than the voice of prudence. So I see troubles coming among ministers, whom I suppose the American difficulty will strengthen until there is some signal reverse. How Canada is to be held until the ice breaks, I cannot conceive.

Letter CIX

Preparation of Material for the January *Rambler*—Archbishop Laud's failure—The Society of St Vincent flourishes in Germany—The lesson of the Revolution—Except by force the Pope can never be safe—How the power was preserved in the Middle Ages—Connexion between temporal power of the Popes and the balance of power of nations

Aldenham, Thursday [*Dec.* 19, 1861].

Supposing there would be much more space, I was going on placidly with an Italian Chronicle, which I cut short and sent you with America,* I fear twelve pages swelled with doctrine, and therefore compressible at your discretion. Green's letter may be curtailed by giving substance for text of Protestant oaths.† I had written a note on the University of Louvain, to meet the charge of Gallicanism, but left it out, because of the length of the letter, and because the peculiarly anti-Gallican character of that faculty must be matter of notoriety.

* In the *Rambler* for January, 1862, pp. 277-292.
† "The Oaths," ibid. pp. 250-265.

Pray omit Capitular notices rather than bits of Campion. Lord Grey is detestable, Napier is as bad. Pray do what you like with Oakeley, but I beseech you to soften the spirit of Oxenham with a discreet communication.* I get twelve to sixteen pages from him regularly thrice a week.

I say Laud failed because he helped to pull down the house about the king's ears and his own. Perhaps you do not agree in my view of the great part played by religion in the rebellion.

Friday [*December* 20].

Beginning at "all over Europe," the end of your paper won't do. I have sketched an alteration which I think keeps the point and leaves out the sting. Pray see whether it will do. Has the Pope made no protest at all? "All over Europe" is a very general statement. St Vincent flourishes gloriously in Germany.

The affair on Guizot is good enough till it comes to the hollow phrases at the end. I think the following points ought to be dwelt on:

The revolution teaches that a government may be subverted by its subjects, irrespective of its merits; while that theory lasts, the Pope can never be safe against his own subjects except by force. Even good government is no security in a revolutionary age—see the cases of Louis Philippe, of Tuscany, in '59. While the revolutionary principle has power therefore, the papal sovereignty must depend on the aid of its neighbours against its subjects. But the revolutionary theory has also an international application and teaches that a State may be absorbed by its neighbours even if it

* Neither his article nor his letter found place in this number.

has not attacked them, when a wish of the kind is presumed on the part of the people, or expressed by insurrection, or ascertained afterwards by vote, or even for rectification of physical boundaries, or for the sake of ethnological connexion. Therefore (which is *à priori* necessarily obvious, as it can't contradict itself), the same revolutionary doctrine which puts governments at the mercy of the people, prevents neighbours protecting it against the people. Therefore in an age where the duty of allegiance and even good government are no security, treaties, and international guarantees, and public law, can be no security.

In the middle ages the Popes preserved their liberty by their authority, by the faith of nations, not by their own political sovereignty; by the moderating influence they exercised over States, which was the keystone of the European system. Simultaneously almost with the final destruction of that system by the cessation of unity of faith and the nationalization of Churches (Concordat of Francis I in 1516, Luther, 1517), the Popes obtained a material basis for the freedom which was losing its spiritual guarantee—through the formation of the sovereign dominion in central Italy by the Borgias, Julius II and the Medici. On this theory they straightway built up a new system to take the place of the old, and this was the system of the balance of power. The political support of the medieval system was the empire; this had now fallen, and as much of it as remained was an alarm to the Pope as an Italian sovereign. The army of Charles V took Rome, and the reluctance of the Holy See to assist the empire in the Thirty Years' war was due to Italian politics.

The violence of Cæsar Borgia, of Julius II in armour, could not continue, and the military manner of founding the State could not go on to preserve it. That would have been contrary to the character of a priestly government. So the Popes undertook to maintain their spiritual freedom through their territorial independence by the opposite plan to that of the *respublica Christiana* under pope and emperor, by *preventing* predominance of any one power, not by courting it. So they created the system of balance of power as the security of their temporal power, as of old the imperial supremacy had been the implement and safeguard of their spiritual predominance. Now the balance of power, which popes kept up in Italy, and by balancing France and Austria, is a system of alliances; and the alliances may very easily vary, be mixed up like a pack of cards, provided a certain equality is the result. The object is peace, not any high ethical purpose; and for this the alliance of Protestant powers is good enough —yea, or of the Turk.

The connexion between the Temporal power and the balance is so clear that when Napoleon raised up a new universal empire, Pacca imagined the Temporal power would become superfluous. Now as balance of power is made up of alliances, it depends on the security of the alliance, that is, on the sanctity of treaties. The revolution, just now in the shape of Cæsarism, naturally upset both. *Result:* In an age of revolution the Temporal power has no security against rebellious subjects or ambitious neighbours. The spiritual liberty of the Church has no safety in a revolutionary State. No solution, therefore, is to be looked for till the revolu-

tion has exhausted itself. Till then provisional safety in some State that is not despotic or revolutionary.

All this as suggestions to you. Say as much of it as you like. It will, I think, give more points to Lathbury's notice. The notion of balance of power being made by the Popes to preserve their Temporal power, instead of the old universal authority, will startle those who think it merely an attack on the old papal supremacy. But I am armed to the teeth with the materials of Italian and papal history, since Libri's sale, and I am sure this is true.

Letter CX

Cardinal Wiseman's denunciation not to be noticed—Newman wishes St John to write for the *Rambler*

Aldenham, Monday night [*Dec.* 23, 1861].

I have just come home from a couple of days' trip to Oxford and into Berkshire. The Guizot must have reached you since you wrote. I hope you have soothed Capes more successfully than Wetherell has Oxenham, who has thrown that function upon me, and I found two very long and plaintive letters awaiting me. I shall try my hand on him to-morrow.

It is best to take no notice of the Cardinal's denunciation. It is impossible to reconcile him or those who believe in him, and as he desires the clergy not to dispute with us, we ought to expect to live in peace. Shall we not give him the benefit of the season?

Tuesday

I shall be surprised if Oxenham insists on having his paper published or consents to alter it. He will see from my letter that though I asked him to write it I did not think much of it.

Your reading of Benedict XIV is very happy. Your rather illiterate anonymous correspondent may be B. Newman has told St John that he must write for the *Rambler*, who therefore offers papers or a paper of exactly this kind, whether competent or otherwise I know not. Certainly versed in the German literature of the Old Testament.

1862

Letter CXI

In secular States the existence of great classes limit the power of the State—Administration of Church property—Liberty consists in the preservation of an inner sphere exempt from State power—Law is national—People cannot administer a law not their own—Difficulty as to religion governing a State—Everything must yield to the preservation of faith—The domain of conscience not distinct from that of the State

Aldenham, January 5, 1862.

Döllinger, whose book has been approved by the Pope—personally—on the strength of an elaborate private report he has made, asks whether he is to send you a copy of the second edition. I discouraged him, but I will send you one of the first edition, where you will find (p. 577) that he agrees with your view of clerical government. All your points seem to me right. An important corollary of the first is that in all secular States the existence of great classes, nobles, clergy, etc., limit the Royal or State power. In Rome the great class of the clergy is the mere creature and instrument of the sovereign. In Protestant countries and those Catholic countries where Church property was seized (Austria, etc.), the monarch had to call into existence a new class for administration of Church property. This was the origin of modern bureaucracy, that is of a class irresistible as against the people, merely an implement as against the crown. This was the step by which loss of Church power or freedom

led to absolutism. But in Rome the clergy = the bureaucracy, which is made ludicrously apparent by giving a clerical garb to secular employés. All liberty consists *in radice* in the preservation of an inner sphere exempt from State power. That reverence for conscience is the germ of all civil freedom, and the way in which Christianity served it. That is, liberty has grown out of the distinction (separation is a bad word) of Church and State. Rome, where they are not distinct, would therefore be like the Caliphate, Russia, etc., but for the difference that in those cases the absolute civil ruler becomes *ipso facto* ruler of the Church, whereas in Rome the anything-but-absolute ruler of the Church is *ipso facto* ruler of the State. The security, therefore, is only in the objectiveness of ecclesiastical law and its transfer on to the State, which is precisely what asceticism overturns.

Law is national, growing on a particular soil, suited to particular character and wants. How peculiar, local, national, influenced by time and place, is the political and social legislation of Moses! But where a religion which is universal inspires the government of a State, it must do so absolutely, regardless of particular conditions, of historical traditions, physical aptitude, moral inclination or geographical connexion. It contradicts the first principle of legislation that it should grow in harmony with the people, that it should be based on habits as well as on precepts (ἦθος—*mos;* θέμις—*Jus*), that it should be identified with the national character and life. On this depends growth, and liberty, and progress, saving tradition. But where a general or different code is imposed on a people, as the civil war was on the

continental States in the fifteenth century, the consequence *must* be State-absolutism. For the system must be administered by experts, legists, jurists, bureaucrats. It must proceed downwards. The people cannot administer a law not their own. This is the reverse of self-government, which proceeds not from a code but from custom, is learnt not from books but from practice, is administered by the people themselves, class for class (i.e., judgement by one's peers, which is the principle of jury; the participation of society in the judgement, the judge representing the State) and place for place—Mayors, J.P., jurisdiction of seigneurs on the Continent to this day in some parts, though that is unreasonable where there is Roman law. However good, therefore, the code may be, if it comes *aliunde* than from national life and history, it destroys self-government and makes the State absolute—even if its forms are liberal. The exception is in conquest, where the vanquished learn the laws and polity of the conquerors, like the Gauls and Spaniards from the Franks and Goths. Intermarriages can at once produce it, destroying monopoly of aptitude and knowledge.

Another point is that a religious government depends for its existence on the belief of the people. Preservation of the faith is *ratio summa status*, to which everything else must yield. Therefore, not only the civil power enforces the religious law, but the transgressions of the religious law must be watched and denounced—therefore espionage and religious detectives, and the use of the peculiar means of information religion provides to give warning to police. The domain of conscience not distinct, therefore, from the domain of the State—sins,

crimes, and sins against faith, even when private, without proselytism, are acts of treason. Seclusion from the rest of the world necessarily follows, if the rest of the world has not the same religion, or even if it is not governed on the same principle. For liberty is extremely contagious. Therefore travel and commerce, facilities of communication, etc., necessarily proscribed, for they would be solvents of a State founded on religion only. But all these prohibitions restrain material as well as intellectual well-being. Poverty and stationary cultivation, that is to say, in comparison to the rest of the world, retrogression, the price of such a government. Two things put an end to this. The economical dependence on other countries which needs ensure, ultimately breaks down the seclusion, as the determination of capital to exploit undeveloped resources is resistless in the long run. And the increase of communication gradually destroys barriers and brings the forbidden knowledge and desires into the sequestered community. All this is perfectly applicable to Tibet and Merv, which correspond with Rome better than the Jews, for among the Jews the priesthood did not retain the ruling power.

All which is more true than new, so forgive me.

What do you hear of the new *Correspondant?* I suppose a last vigorous blow at us. Will it not destroy the *Dublin* and make us quarterly? Don't be indiscreet and angry about it in company.

Letter CXI

Gratry's opinion of Döllinger's book—Lacordaire's last letter before his death shows he held the same views

Aldenham, Monday [*January* 13, 1862].

I have only just had time to read your article, and will keep it a day to put down a variety of glosses that it suggests to me. If then you think any of them worth adopting, it would be wise at the same time to soften the tone of the paper, which is not objective enough, and to weigh certain expressions and definitions where accuracy is of importance. . . Gratry writes of Döllinger's book: "C'est selon moi le livre décisif, destiné à produire un bien incalculable et à fixer l'opinion sur ce sujet. . . Le D. Döllinger nous a rendu à tous un grand service." So much for the man in the *Register* who says I lied when I quoted Gratry in favour. Lacordaire's last letter before his death was a strong expression of the same views. I send you a volume of Gobineau, where you will find an interesting chapter on religion and policy. I have been hard at work, but have too many books.

Letter CXII

Principles of voluntary poverty—Contrast between Benedictines and Franciscans—Effect of living on alms in Spain

Aldenham, Tuesday [*January* 21, 1862].

Your article* has lost nothing either in vigour or in effectiveness by the softened tone. . .

You speak of the Beatitudes; it occurs to me that you might use them more as the root of the Christian revolution in ethics, poor in spirit, etc. These were new ideas in the world. The Sermon on the Mount is the real revelation of a new society, morally. Observe the degeneration of the principle of poverty in an altered society in the friars who followed the monks. It had enriched the old world, if impoverished the modern. For the Benedictines, the real inheritors of the old monastic and ascetic spirit, growing with the growth of Christendom, became wealthy and politically powerful. But the Franciscans, continuing to live on alms, instead of giving them, multiplied overmuch, as it was cheap to found a community of them, requiring only bricks and mortar, and leaving them to beg their food from the poor. In Spain this was one cause of the country falling into decay, and the General of the Order protested at last against the multiplication of his Order. . . Clarendon calls his book *Religion and Policy*. Will that do for your article?

* "The Protestant Theory of Persecution," which appeared in the *Rambler* for March, pp. 318-351.

Letter CXIII

Has found an excellent historical student to write—Wishes Simpson to secure some papers through Weld—Has obtained a MS. life of Mary Stuart—Döllinger recommends books

37, *Half-moon Street*, *Friday* [*March* 28, 1862].

I shall expect you to-morrow afternoon, some time between two and four. We can have a talk and go to Williams and Norgate. The quarterly cannot be as cheap, because we must pay, if possible, £5 a sheet to contributors who will take it. The question is, will advertisements, increased circulation and a sum of, say, five hundred pounds at starting, enable us to do this?

I am in luck. There is an excellent young German historian, who has written on Gregory VII, and practised the historic art in the best of all schools under Böhmer of Frankfort, Dr Helfenstein. He called on me an hour ago, and proves to be established in London, giving lessons and studying in the Record Office for the Catholic history of England. He is anxious for employment, and so I won him by talking German and praising his book, and speaking of his master Böhmer, for all which he was not prepared. I broached no plan but asked him to call on me again, which he is sure to do. He can write English well and is an excellent Anglo-Saxon scholar besides. He will be invaluable, both for articles and for notices of German literature.

It would be a great thing if Newman could be induced to do what Wetherell suggests. F. Ward is thinking of the same thing.

Saturday

I will be at home on Monday at six and till six-thirty in hopes of seeing you after your interview with Weld. My presence would probably not contribute to a satisfactory arrangement, and you are a famous negotiator. Get the papers from him by all means, and renew or extend the offer if you see cause. He must have bought the papers, and therefore his price will be fixed. I have also got on the way from Germany a MS. life of Mary Stuart, which may also help to an article. Teulet also throws light. I sent him to you only for a short notice. Bolto's introduction may or may not be worth something. There ought to be some security from him that he has sent all the papers on the subject that he knew of or could find. If there is any reticence, the blame would fall on us.

Döllinger knows nothing of the missionary question, but recommends inspection of Mislin, *Les Lieux Saints*, and the *Bullarium Congregationis de Propaganda Fide*. I asked Wetherell to forward Russell's letter to you. It is hard to believe that the Cardinal will come to terms with us, but Russell is well disposed. Monsell is very eager for the success of our scheme, and wishes to write articles and republish them as pamphlets—a way of getting Irish circulation.

It was perfectly settled that *Campion* was to be struck off at *Rambler* expense, and Robson must understand that it will continue to be so printed.

Letter CXIV

A debate in Parliament—Tories opposed to Disraeli but hate Gladstone—Evidence of party disorganization—Stansfeld's manner—Bright's bitterness

37 *Half-moon Street, Wednesday* [1862].

Nothing could be more suggestive for your article than the debate of last night. The point is more in the short speeches than in the long. Walpole and the regular Tories don't want Dizzy in, but hate Gladstone, and the amendment was aimed at him. It would have weakened him, they calculated, without turning out Palmerston. But the party men, looking for office, and fresh from Lord Derby's meeting, were less solicitous of keeping Palmerston in, and only did not wish at first for a direct attack. So they were angry with Walpole for betraying them and their hopes, and spoke of future occasions for renewing the fight. When Lord R. Montague and others said there was no party intention, they were very feebly cheered by the Opposition. There never was a greater proof of party disorganization.

Observe Walpole's dread of upsetting Palmerston. Heathcote's ditto, and anger at Disraeli. Foster's preference of Dizzy's views of retrenchment to Palmerston's, and dread only of his foreign policy. Whiteside's indignation at losing his chance. Osborne said some good things. Disraeli, bitter against Walpole, spoke very mellifluously at the end, but with anger peeping out.

Observe also perfect absence of ideas in Cobden.

Stansfeld's manner was quite perfect, language exquisite—rather too laboured. But it seems now pretty clear that he has very few ideas. Bow-wow platitudes was a fair description of his speech. When Osborne said that Foster pulled the strings, he meant, what Foster's speech showed, that he was the man among the Radical leaders Dizzy has best succeeded in catching. Bright's bitterness against the Government is now very great. This is what Disraeli reckoned on. Osborne very rightly complained of Italian unity. It was Palmerston's only real topic of defence. As the most popular point he clung to it. I did not hear Horsman, but he knows something of politics, which very few others do. There was one idea in Stansfeld: that is, large bodies move only on simple lines, rather awkwardly; so masses of public opinion cannot distinguish or refine.

I shall see Gladstone to-night and will try to get a light.

Letter CXV

A Conservative reaction—Gladstone an object of particular hatred—An aristocratic element of reaction in foreign affairs—Palmerston's strong feeling against Austria—Reaction manifested logically in Roebuck's speeches—Attitude of Catholics to Italian question—Palmerston tolerated because he is cheerful and wounds no pride

Aldenham, Wednesday [? 1862].

The occasion of the Conservative reaction is the alliance of the Liberals with the Radicals in finance and in foreign affairs. Gladstone chiefly represents this alliance, in its financial aspect, and he is consequently the object of the particular hatred of the reactionists,

and he has found it necessary to abjure Bright. This is in one way a revival or continuation of Protectionism —and dislike of direct taxation. The type of this party in Parliament is Sir Stafford Northcote and the group of City men: Baring, Hubbard, etc., who always oppose Gladstone's budgets. Northcote's new book* will contain the case of this party.

Then there is another aristocratic element of reaction in foreign affairs. Aristocracy loves aristocracy. Now the only real political *noblesse* on the continent is the Austrian. So the tendency of our aristocracy is to deplore the defeats of Austria, and the progress of France and Piedmont, whose system is averse to real aristocracy, denying primogeniture and having no hereditary senators. Palmerston's strong and open feeling against Austria, and her great perplexities in the last three years, have strengthened this feeling far beyond what it was when they were in office. Lord Malmesbury still speaks the old language, not really Austrian. But his far abler under-secretary, Seymour Fitzgerald, shows this clearly enough. Now inasmuch as aristocracy is the framework of liberty, sincere friends of liberty must have the same sympathy with Austria. Accordingly the Conservative reaction in foreign affairs manifests itself most oddly, though quite logically, in Roebuck's speeches. Whereas moreover this is a class tendency, it is shared partly by the old Whigs—" the old gentlemen who go to bed at 11 o'clock," as Bernal Osborne defines that political connexion. These are the old stagers and fogies at Brookes', old Ellice, Sir F. Baring, Charles Greville

* *Twenty Years of Financial Policy.*

and a coterie of Whigs, who, for instance, think the Pope a very ill-used man.

Now of these two tendencies together—anti-direct taxation and anti-French alliance, the meeting-point of which is the commercial treaty, which he so powerfully assailed—the most eminent representative is Horsman.

There is another cause to be followed in the same direction, America, on which I need not enlarge. Gregory is the best representative of this in the House of Commons. This is what has shelved reform so completely, and gives to Gregory's reform speech in May, 1860—which was merely an account of his American journey—a certain significance.

There is another element of Conservative reaction in the position of Catholics. Their attitude in the Italian question has persuaded many that they are really hostile to liberty and alien to our institutions, and this has strengthened the Protestant feeling against them, even among Liberals and Radicals, *especially* among these. The Conservatives who would stand with the Catholics (Bowyer, Hennessy, etc.) politically, will not do so on religious opinions, and leave it to the extravagant Tories of the second rank, Baillie, etc., to support them. But Whalley, who is a Liberal, really represents an anti-Catholic movement, which takes its root in Italy. So there are a lot of different things, some good and some bad (Roebuck, Whalley or Gregory, Northcote) helping on a Conservative reaction. Real forces in that direction mixed up with artificial and unreal elements.

They do not take a practical shape in an attack against Government, because they are heterogeneous

and contradictory. On some points (reform) the Government goes along with them and disarms them, on others they cannot unite against it. Then there is the position of Palmerston, who is tolerated because he is cheerful and wounds no pride, and because he is old and excites no envy. The opposition like him and consider him a Conservative. He suits the bad Conservative instincts just as he adopts the sins of the Liberals, and is strong because he is wrong. Gladstone could not hold the Government together for a week if Palmerston were to die, because of his genius, of his principles and of his pugnacity. The only man who could disarm opposition in a different way from Palmerston would be Lewis, who has gained ground wonderfully of late.

You can count up the practical reactionists among the late successful candidates by seeing how many condemned Palmerston's foreign policy, and declared against reform—on the hustings. More later.

If you have not written to John Arundell, don't, please. I should do it myself, as I must explain to him that I have to say of Bellings what he perhaps won't like. If Minardi is beautiful, let's have him; as he is evidently foolish, let us put him into "communicated." Have you discovered about Brownson, whether he goes or no? I would write to him, if he was silent, to get him to help us. I think he would be glad to do it, if his own organ is no more, and he cannot otherwise be heard in Europe.

I have no sanguine hopes of my letter to Morris succeeding. Our position ought to be strengthened by the wisdom of our first few numbers.

Husenbeth has written a *Life of Milner*, which he cannot get published. Should we ask for the MS. to make an article of it, giving him the value of the article and making it also an advertisement and puff of his book? It is a capital subject. Green here is Husenbeth's friend.

Letter CXVI

Döllinger is delighted with the last chapter of Simpson's "Campion" —The question of the reception of Charles II into the Church

37 *Half-moon Street, Tuesday* [*April* 1, 1862].

Your last chapter on Campion* has overwhelmed the Professor with delight, who asks why you do not enlarge your scope into a *Geschichte des Englischen Religionswesens unter Elizabeth*, and hopes you will publish as fully as possible your precious materials.

Bolto won't do at all. He has written nothing but commonplaces, possesses no collateral illustrative information, and knows only Hume and Lingard. Then he is diffuse, as if all he has copied out of them was perfectly new. There is only one successful piece of combination where he tries to make up for the gaps of his papers. For they do not actually prove that the king was ever received into the Church before his death. A better case for that can be made out of the scene at his deathbed than out of these documents. Nevertheless an interesting paper could be made out of them, by throwing in other matter, were it only from Macaulay. So they must be got; but Weld has only to read Bolto's narrative to see the absurdity of the no-

* In the March *Rambler*, pp. 366 seqq.

tion of publishing a single line of it. It is unfit even for the *Dublin Review* and the congruity of Finlason.

Letter CXVII

End of all negotiations with the *Dublin Review*—The proposed change of the *Rambler* to a quarterly

37 *Half-moon Street, Saturday* [*April* 5, 1862].

Here is the end of the *Dublin* negotiations and the beginning of the fight; a stand-up fight it will be. It is very likely the whole thing is got up in consequence of our scheme.* Allies, having disbelieved what Wetherell and I said about the decline of the *Dublin*, perhaps indicates that they were already scheming. It will be necessary now to announce our change as soon as possible, in order to be in the field first if possible. At any rate, they cannot well bring out their first new number for a month after us at least.

Do not be indiscreet in your talk at Clapham. Pray think of a very good article for July.

Letter CXVIII

History of the negotiations for an amalgamation of the *Rambler* and *Dublin Review*—Newman's arbitration refused

The Athenæum, Wednesday [*April* 16, 1862].

I think Burns's letter might be useful. You ought to tell him that I, for my part, am as anxious now as I was in the autumn to get rid of the trouble

* To issue the *Rambler* henceforth quarterly. This resolution was subsequently carried into effect, and the name of *The Home and Foreign Review* was chosen.

and responsibility of the editorship, and that all I care for is the certainty that there shall be an organ of free discussion, which shall be in all respects as good a review as it can be made. Accordingly, before making the change in the *Rambler*, I made preliminary overtures to the *Dublin Review*, and Dr Russell* distinctly said that he saw nothing in my proposal which could be an obstacle to a perfect agreement and combination. He only asked for time, and we accordingly postponed our announcement. But Dr Russell found that arrangements were already being made to put the *Dublin* on a new footing, and it was therefore impossible to hope for any result of the negotiations. Burns must therefore understand that the notion of union was rejected before any conditions could be discussed, and when Russell thought it both possible and extremely desirable, because the *Dublin* informed us that it was going to be revived and reformed. Under these circumstances we published our intention in the newspapers. You should add that, as to Allies, whom he puts forward, I have seen him, and he has assured me of his sympathy with the scheme as it is. He should also be told that if on public grounds he wishes to see us united, he ought to have gone to the *Dublin* people, who have rejected the idea. When it was proposed by the other side we accepted, making only one condition—that of Newman's arbitration, which they rejected. We have now made proposals ourselves, which the old master of the *Dublin* eagerly accepted; but the plan turned out to

* President of the Maynooth College, and, with Cardinal Wiseman, co-editor at one time of the *Dublin Review*.

be impracticable because the *Dublin* has already made other arrangements.

If I were you, I would not say very much more than this. Mark your letter "private," because of Russell. Does Burns seriously suppose that his "men of the same stamp" could seriously accept our motto?

Put on the wisdom of the serpent and answer diplomatically. The tone to take is not defiant or triumphant but regarding the rejection as irrevocable and our advertisement as an engagement.

Letter CXIX

Preparations for the May *Rambler*—Suggestions as to writers and subjects for July

37 *Half-moon Street, Good Friday* [*April* 18, 1862].

I have done twenty-five pages of Foreign Events, or doctrine, on Italy, Mexico and Prussia.* The letter will be seven pages,† on Monday, as they will not print for a couple of days at Easter. That makes my contribution of thirty-two pages.

Sullivan, overcome by my account of our intentions, offers indefinite articles on half a dozen subjects, Celtic Philology, Asiatic Ethnology, Ceramic Ware, Chemistry, Geology, Mineralogy, Mining, Agriculture and Physical Science in general. I will try to bind him at once for current literature. He will hardly be able to give an article in July.

I am off to-morrow, for no holiday, but to do

* Which appeared in the May *Rambler*, pp. 546-572.

† This letter by Acton, signed N.N., on "The Danger of Physical Science," ibid. pp. 526-534.

"Nationality" under the benigner heaven of my own country. Pray tell me what books I am to pack up for you.

France; Mr Browning; Blockade; Nationality; Charles II; Wetherell; Paley; Ormsby, will probably be nearly our contents for July. There ought to be something Irish and something religious soon.

Letter CXX

Bishop Grant and Simpson—Acton suggests a line of reply to the Bishop's strictures

Aldenham, Tuesday [*April* 22, 1862].

I think it very possible the Bishop,* egged on by common rumour and deceived by eminent reports,

* Bishop Grant of Southwark at the time wrote to Simpson about the rumours and reports as to his style of treating dangerous subjects. The Bishop pointed out that some of the writings in the *Rambler* were not such as to attract people to the Church. "Even if you could defend them," he tells Mr Simpson, "because you affix an orthodox meaning to them in your own heart, surely they are not necessary to the world, and if not necessary, why waste your talents, which are very great, and your time, which you are anxious to spend well?" . . "Do not let us discuss how much or how little these writings can be defended. I could not finish this letter yesterday and it is already Easter eve. Why make you sad at such a time by asking you to withdraw from a position in which you have so actively and so earnestly occupied yourself? Oh, my dearest friend, you have given generously and often during the past year for the faithful, for the poor, for the Church, and I am deeply grateful to you; and if I humbly and urgently entreat you to take henceforth the part of silence, or, if you write and publish, the choice of subjects that do not affect the Church and the Holy See, you will be as generous in forgiving me as you have been munificent in helping my poor flock."

In reply, Simpson, on April 23, 1862, says: "Brought up as I was, I have no other resource but literature. And being a Catholic, I cannot help writing as a Catholic—in matters defined, taking the one side defined; in doubtful matters, choosing my side according to my convictions and trying to recommend my opinions to others. I am convinced in what I have written I have

may have never had before him your case and has never considered the points which go the other way. He is at the same time a true and holy man, and a weak man. I would, in your place, bear all this in mind in replying and write as moderate and religious and grave an explanation as possible in answer. Of course you cannot assist contrition and penance, for a journal deals necessarily with public topics and cannot handle the private spiritual concerns of individuals. But you can assist faith by defending the truth, to the best of your ability, which cannot be done by *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi;* and you can help charity by giving an example of an objective and dispassionate way of writing, which does not attack the person but the error.

You can hardly avoid a discussion, which he deprecates, because he keeps to generalities. What you propose to say is, I think, quite the thing, but pray assume, if you can, ignorance and good intention in the correspondent.

not gainsaid any definition of the Church, nor gone beyond the liberty permitted to all Catholics in doubtful points. And I am convinced also that, in spite of many blunders and follies, the general line I have taken is one that is supremely necessary for the cause of truth . . . As to your advice about not touching on theological matters, it is the same as Dr Newman has urged on me before and again lately, and it is advice I try to observe. But all my studies have been on subjects that have some slight relation to theology, politics, metaphysics and physical science, and it is very difficult, all but impossible, for me to keep off the tabooed territory, and the more I try the more I fail. I thought I was progressing that way, and lo, Wenham and Allies are disgusted with me for ignoring the supernatural; and Marshall (if he is (*im*)*pudens*) accuses me of infidelity. See what I get by keeping clear of theology!'

Letter CXXII

Father Bolto's Stuart Papers

Aldenham, Friday [*April* 25, 1862].

I have nearly finished my dissertation on Bolto's papers. I shall actually quote very little of them, and eke out the information they contain from the contemporary writers. But it would be a foolish predicament if I could not show copies of the letters themselves after quoting them for such very singular and unlikely facts. Do you think Weld would acquiesce in the papers remaining till after the appearance of the article, or would it be best to have the copies copied? I have tried to hunt out traces of James Stuart in every direction, and have wasted a great deal of time with no success beyond the year 1670. I am persuaded that he went to S. Omers or Watten in the winter of 1668-9 and was ordained there—under what name does not appear. But if one could see a list of all novices who entered at S. Omers, and of all Jesuits ordained priests there, between January, 1669, and October, 1670, it would probably be possible to trace him further. I shall express my acknowledgments to Bolto without alluding to the Gesù.

There is yet one point on which Father Bolto might manage to throw light, but it is a very feeble chance. The manuscripts of Oliva the General must be at the Gesù. It would be curious to find that of the letter marked 633, vol. II, p. 7 of the Bologna edition—al

Rè di N. This anonymous king is either John Casimir of Poland or Charles II. I cannot from internal evidence determine which, though if I did not know, through these MSS., that Oliva corresponded secretly with Charles, I should have had no suspicion that it could be meant for him. If the letter is to him, then the Jesuit spoken of in it, also anonymously, is James Stuart. If it is to the King of Poland, I do not see why his name should have been concealed, as there are other letters from Oliva to him without any disguise. I do not know whether Weld takes interest enough in the question to inquire further. I cannot say that this is a promising clue.

Letter CXXIII

Amalgamation with the *Dublin* is again discussed—Dr Russell and Canon Macmullen consent to act as advisers—Acton's terms for amalgamation

Aldenham, Saturday [*April* 26, 1862].

You have brought——to book at last. As to-morrow is Sunday, I have time to think about the best way of using the information and turning to account the present situation, which is sufficiently good. I greatly dislike the notion of meeting Morris yet on the subject. He is positive, obstinate, narrow, prejudiced and extremely pontifical. But he is intelligent and straightforward, and ought to be, and I suspect is, grateful to me for the constant support I have given him against many adversaries throughout the Poor Law inquiry. The moral of this is that he ought to be communicated with, but indirectly. He is not quite pleni-

potentiary; therefore, he ought to be met by some intermediate agent. Where one party is represented by an agent who can be disavowed, and the other must stand by every word he says, the first has a great advantage. Now Burns is not eligible for the purpose. Allies occurs to me as the best man. He can hardly have shaken off yet the impression I made on him a fortnight ago, and he is so far disconnected with us that he will look like an independent actor. He is overwhelmed with work this week, and will only pass on my letter, but as it is the week of his glory and persecution, he will give it an impetus as it passes through his hands. If nothing is done at once, the Cardinal may take advantage of the presence of the bishops to try to do something for the *Dublin*. But I think I would at the same time write to Russell, on whose good will I think I can rely.

My line would be perfectly independent, but extremely conciliatory. I would say that I loved peace much, knowledge and honesty more, and that the arrangement of communicated articles will enable us to combine the two; that two distinguished priests offered to advise us, Russell as to questions of theology, Macmullen as to questions of policy—the first would preserve our harmony with the Church, the last with the clergy. The first offer, however, contingent with the disappearance of the *Dublin*. In that case I should be happy to accept the friendly offers, to drop the name *Rambler* and to publish the united Quarterly on July 1. I do not see that there is any other concession possible, or that Newman's name can in any way be used, or that there would be any security if I offered to retire at once from the editorship.

Proposed Prospectus

Conservative reaction for ever. See the weeklies for the dates of elections. You shall have mine when I get back. I think they are not in my room. I have no time to-day to write or even to think about it, or to write to Wetherell about Burns, etc. It is reckoned in sieges that one shot in four hundred kills a man. Shall we take the same proportions in our prospectus and send out four hundred thousand to get one thousand subscribers, or will it be enough to take away two noughts? The next time you dine out let it be known that you are going abroad for the summer.

Letter CXXIV

The conversion of Charles II—The negotiations with the *Dublin*—Editorial limitations—"Communicated" articles

Aldenham, Monday [*April* 28, 1862].

Many thanks for your inquiries sent to Weld. I am sure Bellings' letters must contain information.

If you should be going to the State Paper Office, you might surely discover something—

1. About Bellings' mission to Rome, October, 1662, and Aubigny's cardinalate.

2. About correspondence with Rome in August-November, 1668, or January, 1669.

3. Any letters from Jersey, April 17, June 24, 1646, in which the name of de la Cloche occurs. Anything concerning the release from prison of a clergyman of that name in that interval. But these were things done so privately that there may be nothing.

If, at the Museum, you have time to get a look at

the Vatican transcripts, Marini's collection, you will find only a volume or so about Charles II, with a register of contents. Anything therein about reconciliation with Rome, between 1662 and 1672, ought to be entrusted to Davis to copy.

I heard yesterday from Ranke, who is not at all prepared for the discovery.

To-day I am writing to Morris, with as much discretion as possible.

I have given Morris:

1. A statement of the theory of editorial articles, which are not to be all the editor thinks, but confined to certain limits.

2. An explanation of the wide margin on both sides of the editorial department in communicated articles. No test of opinion there, only merit, sincerity, etc.

3. As theology cannot be omitted, (1) as many priests to write as possible: (2) Russell's offer of supervision for theology, and Macmullen's for policy, to be accepted.

Finally, one or two explanations of personal views which may be misunderstood, and a general declaration that we shall be very happy to amalgamate on those conditions (that is, that we offer those terms provided the *Dublin* will disappear from the face of the earth), and that at the same time we shall be perfectly content and peaceful if they refuse.

Letter CXXV

Simpson's research at the S.P.O.—A German Protestant promises contributions—The *Dublin*

Aldenham, Saturday [*May* 3, 1862].

It is a shame to give you so much trouble at the S. P. O. Your discoveries and suggestions are extremely useful. You must read my dissertation and then see what can be got. Clarendon clearly lied in his throat. Hoskin's book will be useful. I think the name is taken from a particular de la Cloche, who cut a figure just then, and may have christened the child. A first-rate German liberal Protestant has offered an article at once, and promises a vista of more. He is writing the life of Gustavus Adolphus, so to make sure of him I have sent him a very important paper on that personage's schemes which I found at Rome.

I bring to town Dentinger's paper on German philosophy since Hegel, with a translation, which will only help you to read the German. I also bring Galileo for Roberts, and Montalembert for Wetherell.

Morris has written, saying he thinks an arrangement possible and desirable—but he says he is nobody.

Letter CXXVI

The English and Spanish systems of colonization—Bacon's view of plantations—Discussions with Oxenham

Aldenham, Thursday [1862].

There is this great difference between Spanish and English colonies, looking at them quite *ab extra*, that the Spaniards undertook to discharge the duties of a higher religion and civilization to the natives, whilst the English quietly ignored the natives altogether. Undoubtedly the first cause of this is the fact that the Church formed a link uniting Spaniards and natives, which was wanting in the English colonies.

A second point is this: Labour in the tropics is hateful and unnatural to Europeans, whilst in Northern countries it suits them. Therefore the Spaniards required the natives to do their work for them; the English did their own. We have a signal proof of this in the fact that in the Southern colonies of the English they provide a race of labourers accustomed to the hot sun, who do the work for them. Moreover, the natives in the countries we colonized lived by the chase and were not cultivators of the soil. The South Americans in very many countries had already fixed settlements and a high agricultural culture. The English aborigines therefore could not be easily utilized, the Spanish easily as well as necessarily.

Then there is this great difference. The English colonies in general were founded by the emigrants, for

themselves, not by or for the State. They were in opposition to the home country, and were, more or less, originally sectarian—that is, exclusive in their religion, not members of a great, spreading religious organization. In these two respects the Spaniards were entirely different. They went forth as emissaries of the State, labouring for it, helped and guided by it, and controlled, at the same time, by a Church which had very similar duties towards the natives as towards them. Thus they were under a double control which was wanting in North America.

The English colonists could only ignore the natives because their political principles were liberal; there was no overwhelming State power over them. Where class rules over class, a strong, supreme power is (1) *necessary*, because one must be watched and the other protected, as the duties of the State and its interests oblige it to preserve both alike; and (2) *possible*, because the dominion of one class over the other gives to the dominant class a compensation that makes it tolerant of oppression from above, whilst it partly deadens to the lower class the force of the State, partly represents it as a protection from the social domination (as in Russia). Thus absolute monarchy delights in *castes*, in the modulation of citizenship fixed and determined by blood (Creole, Octoroon, etc.), in *slavery*, which even where there is no monarchy tends to make the State absolute, and absolutism a blessing.

The English colonies were fed by the condition of the mother-country—over-population (at first), religious oppression, civil troubles. All this drove them out by a natural impulse. But in Spain there were the best

possible reasons to remain at home. No man went out for good, if he could help it. The whole thing had to be organized by the public authority, and had, therefore, a political character. The English went forth from the weakness and sickness of England, at the time of greatest weakness (Stuarts)—the Spanish from the superabundant force of Spain. *Therefore*, as the first relied upon themselves, they flourished and grew independent naturally—the latter declined as the mother-country declined, developed no independent resources —and when they violently broke off, had no vitality in them.

Observe that Bacon (Essay of Plantations) wishes colonies to be planted only on virgin soil, not where natives must be dispossessed or destroyed—a characteristic difference.

All this is great nonsense and not much to the point. As to Dante there is much to be said. Let me know by return of post what books I am to bring to town, or what subjects you want books about. I come up Monday by our new railway.

Darnell is gone. Oxenham goes to-morrow, having exhausted the topics of possible discussion with me and kept me up till half-past two in the morning for a fortnight. I have not been free to read or write a page all this time, but will turn these two days to account to furnish Wetherell with trouble next week.

Letter CXXVII

Brewer likely to be a troublesome contributor—The "Lingard Society"—Negotiations for copies from the Vatican Archives—Books to review

37, *Half-moon Street, Saturday night* [*May* 1, 1862].

Your Austria was a miracle of speed. Brewer is evidently meant by fate to write for us, but he will give us great trouble. I will take advantage of the opening, and write as you suggest.

As to the other question I must postpone my answer rather than reject the offer. The *Philobiblon* is to have a paper on Richelieu, so that is no difficulty. But the "Lingard Society"? I meditate a volume by way of inauguration, which ought to contain those papers, the life of Mary Stuart and many more important papers. For I am in negotiation with Theiner for manuscripts from the Vatican archives. He offers to let me have many letters of Henry VIII to four Popes; the *acts* of the *trial* of his divorce; letters of Wolsey and of Beatoun; some of Mary Stuart to Rome, inedited all; James II's letters to the Pope, the answers; letters of Sunderland and Mary Beatrice; of the exiled Irish Bishops under William, etc. He says he wants money for the fourth volume on the Temporal Power, that the Pope has none to give, that he will regard payment as a gift to St Peter, etc.

To whom I, making many conditions, have made a magnificent offer. There would probably be matter for a couple of volumes altogether. If this fails me, I

think Romilly's idea might be entertained. I would put them off with some allusion to arrangements now pending, but not absolutely. The thing itself I wish to keep very quiet.

Will you review Stanley's letter to the Bishop of London on subscription? The claims of the Bible and science, letters between Maurice and a layman? Howitt's Supernatural? The Polish Captivity, by Sutherland Edwards? Keble's Life of Wilson?

Letter CXXVIII

Further researches into the history of the Stuarts—Simpson's *Life of Campion*—The *Life of Milner*

Aldenham, Sunday [*May* 4, 1862].

I believe it is not necessary to persecute Lord Arundell. The history is tolerably clear so far as it goes. In the later negotiation, 1669-70, I think Bellings remained at Paris with Lord Arundel. He neither knew what was done then in Rome, nor wrote letters that would be at Wardour.

But your Neapolitan discovery is very curious. De la Cloche disappears at the end of 1668 on his way to Rome. I have no certain trace of him after. He was not yet ordained. Pray pursue your researches. There is a mystery here. Nothing could be more grave and respectable than the character of young Stuart, as I make it out, and I am almost sure of being on his traces afterwards. But to introduce the Neapolitan story at the moment of his disappearance from the documents would be a stroke of art.

Simpson's "Campion"

I really don't think a continuous history could be carried on through successive numbers of a miscellaneous quarterly. If I was you, I would announce conspicuously in the July advertisements in the press—*Life of Edmund Campion*, by R. Simpson. Then finish your MS. in the autumn and print it as hitherto—"Typis Cong. de Propaganda Fide," or "Tipog. della Civiltà Cattolica," as Taparelli's and other works are. Then we will write a review and cut it up in the quarterly.

I see Milner is coming out. He must have an article in October. I may manage to get some papers on the subject.

Letter CXXIX

Proposed successor to the *Rambler*—Contributions by Morris, Capes and Paley—"Elements of Conservative Reaction"

[37 *Half-moon Street*], *Tuesday night* [*May* 20, 1862].

I finished my committee to-day, so that I can be at your orders and Roberts's when you like. What he says confirms my view that it is better not to keep the old name, and that all practically necessary continuity will be preserved by the publisher's arrangements, the colour, the motto, the persons and the animus.

Morris sends half a paper on the Gospels, and one on bazaars, which I think might be made very good. Of the first I say nothing, like Solon, till I have seen the end. Capes promises his article at once; also short notices. Paley consents to necessary modifications, and

accepts the classical short notices department and promises a MS. paper for October. I hope you will not confine your political article within too narrow limits, taking only one or two threads. I can only repeat what I said, that Horsman, Roebuck, America, represent elements of Conservative reaction. Distinguish reaction from confirmed *vis inertiæ*.

Why did we not meet at the Exhibition to-day? I went with Wetherell to Williams and Norgate. I have sent Paley a list of classical publications, besides what he may have, offering to send the books.

1, Conservative reaction; 2, Roberts; 3, Paley; 4, Capes; 5, 6, Morris; 7, Klopp; 8, Nationality; 9, Charles II; 10, Woodstock; 11, Blockade; 12, Ormsby, Africa; 13, Minardi.

One may fail, one may be rejected. We want grievously a purely literary article on some book or writer of the day.

We shall be well supplied. Abraham gives a more detailed account of himself, not very promising. We will try him either on Irish or French subjects.

It would be a great thing in your article to give characters of Gladstone, Disraeli, Stanley and, if possible, Palmerston and Russell, if we three can agree upon them. A slight element of personality is beneficial, especially in the hands of men really independent.

Letter CXXX

Criticism of Simpson's paper on "Conservative Reaction"—Some other contributors—A writer on Biblical science

37 *Half-moon Street, Wednesday* [*June* 11, 1862].

Morris is not so long as you suppose—58 sheets of 280 words, that is 36 pages. But this is no reason not to clip and improve.

Neither Wetherell nor I altogether like the paper on Conservative reaction. My own feeling was that you are not so attentive a reader of the papers as people must be who have to get up small talk for dinner parties in the season, and so were less overflowing with information and background than your figures required to do them full justice. The real fault, however, is mine with my foolish notes, which I am afraid were an impedimentary influence on you. Unless you are quite sure of everything on which Wetherell has a bone to pick, it would be safer, if you don't mind it, to be "communicated." If you sign with an X, it will furnish a happy and congenial pun.

The French note is best in the original, I think. I will write to Ornsby to hurry the rest of his article. Sullivan and Renouf formerly promised short notices, and I wrote some days ago to remind them. They do not answer, which I take to be a good sign. Arnold ditto. John O'Hagan undertakes the Irish chronicle and even offers an article besides, overcome by my judiciously complimentary letter. This is not only a

great relief for Wetherell, but an excellent thing for our Irish circulation. He wishes his name not to be spoken.

Instead of short notices of recent books my Ratisbon friend has sent me an article on the present state of Biblical science with reference to religion—*pour orienter*, promising regular contributions to the review department in future numbers. The article is clever, spirited, and exactly in our tendency; but as he avoids going into particulars, because of his future short notices, it would appear rather superficial and beating about the bush. I will either ask him to work into it notices of the great writers, and of the late publications, for a very good October article, or I will break it up and distribute it among the short notices when they come. Which do you advise?

Helfenstein will not do for an article, but with further compression will be a good short notice, hardly longer than one or two of Paley's, and a warning to you for writing such very short ones. The subject would be a good one for an article, with the use of other books, and it may be a question whether I should not furnish Helfenstein with the necessary literature and ask him to do it for January. He does not seem to me to understand proportion.

Letter CXXXI

J. Brande Morris on the Gospels—Darnell a model historical writer

37 *Half-moon Street, Thursday*
[*June* 12, 1862].

Jack Morris owes you a great deal, and to my profane mind it is an excellent article* as you have cooked it. The reduction of the passage on the title seems to me an improvement for which he ought to be grateful.

Wetherell is going to send Darnell's book to you. It will be a lesson of objectiveness and scientific method. Pray observe in reading it how history differs from other sciences by confining the author to matter supplied by the sources. The author does not put in reflections, combinations, explanations of his own not suggested or furnished by his materials, no subjective scheme to explain the progress of paganism, no light borrowed *ab extra* to explain its origin, no theological illustration of the devil's part in oracles, no improving of any occasion for moralizing. Excepting the works on pure philosophy and classical antiquities I know no specimen of German literature exhibiting more remarkably this sort of self-denial, which is the condition of scientific history. Darnell's only fault that I know, is a certain copiousness and superabundance of style, but he says this does not appear in the second volume,

* "The Evangelistic Symbols as a Key to the Gospels," by J. Brande Morris, appeared in the first number of the *Home and Foreign Review*, July, 1862.

which I have not read. He has verified all the quotations, as you know, and corrected or altered some of them.

Letter CXXXII

Suggests "Wolsey" as the subject of an article by Brewer—The contents of the October number of the *Home and Foreign*—Milman is staggered and "in a fix"

[*June* 17, 1862.]

Brewer fears he cannot extricate more from the hands of the *National*, but he is ready to give us an article—year article—on any subject we please. Pray answer by return what you think of Wolsey, for whom he must have lots of not yet registered materials.

In case Roberts fails us, will you prepare Dentinger for October? How shall we stand as to supply? Proverbs; *Names;* Foundlings; *Poor Law;* German Philosophy; *Brownson and Simpson; Wolsey;* Mary Stuart; Medieval Universities; *English University Education for Catholics; The Irish Church;* Celtic Literature; *Sir James Graham; Volunteers.*

Belgium (Arenat); Italy (Lacaita); or Poland (Buddens); or Australia (Childers).

I have been corresponding with Renouf about the article on University Education for Catholics, who likes the idea, but cannot yet make up his mind. I have sketched a famous article for him, and he is coming up to talk it over. Milman, to whom I sent the proofs of his article, is a good deal staggered and is in a fix, seeing that his book is being reprinted.

Lathbury wants the subject of Sir James Graham;

but we must know first what Gladstone prefers to write on in October. I have a learned paper on the places where the Three Kings stopped on the way from *Milan to Cologne*, ending with some doubts as to its having been the Three Kings at all; to be civilly returned.

Letter CXXXIII

The decay of Brownson

37 *Half-moon Street*, *Tuesday* [*June* 31, 1862].

I wish you joy of the perversion of Brownson. Certainly, when I knew him in his prime, nine years ago, the light was not kindled in him, and I thought it never would come, because of his imperfect education and his unhistoric mind. He is not sixty, and his decay is pitiful and premature; and his letter, to one who knew him, very melancholy. Perhaps it will be well to encourage him with fair promises, as it would be a comfort to him in deciding about giving up his review to know that he could write in another at his ease without the trouble of editing.

Letter CXXXIV

Bishop Ullathorne attacks the methods of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign*—Newman counsels submission—Acton's own course

Aldenham, *Friday* [*October* 31, 1862].

. . . I have not seen Bishop Ullathorne's letter* yet, but I suppose the *Home and Foreign* comes in for its share. Now, so far as I see my way, I am decidedly

* Bishop Ullathorne addressed a letter to his clergy upon the methods of the *Rambler* and the *Home and Foreign*, which was chiefly aimed at Simpson.

against any public answer on the part of the Review. I was against answering the Cardinal, and see much stronger reason against answering Bishop Ullathorne. Newman writes a singularly absurd letter, saying that Ullathorne's is the voice of the Church; that there is no opposition or explanation possible, and seems to ask what we mean to do. He tells Arnold he means to submit in the fullest manner. I can only tell him that the Review will not combat or resist the censure.

The only thing I can do is this: Sooner or later I shall either hear from my bishop, or have an opening to write to him about Bishop Ullathorne. Now I ought to be able to explain to him why the blunders and faults of his episcopal brother make it impossible to make any public acknowledgement.

Letter CXXXV

Parochial relief of the poor—The difference between charity and relief —The evils of relief by means of public works

Aldenham, Wednesday [*August* 20, 1862].

You seem to me quite right about Poor Relief, always sticking to the distinction between pillaging your neighbour and the community. The rate and the relief must be local, in order that the atomic system prevail not, which would be the result if it was not communal, if rates were entirely equalized. On the other hand, by making the area of a rate too small, as the parish often is now, the evil is often aggravated, as the poor must pay for the poor, and the machinery for the relief of paupers increases the number of pau-

pers, and spoils with one hand the good it does with the other.

The use of the word *bienfaisance* is detestable. It means charity, not relief. One is personal and *individual*, private, voluntary and a channel of spiritual influence; the other impersonal, official, mechanical, unconnected with any spiritual end or action. One is merely negative, keeps men alive; the other occupies itself in detail with their condition, raises them up, stops the supply of paupers, whilst the other combats not poverty but starvation.

The avoidance of a Poor Law by means of public works not actually necessary is characteristic of centralized absolutism. It nurses artificially a proletariate, a classless community, which, instead of being absorbed in its own places, is permanently relying on the State to provide for it, not by barely keeping it alive and leaving to vice and improvidence all its natural effects, but by raising it up to the level of those who are able to provide for themselves, as far as present profits go, only depriving it of the possibility of becoming independent and normally self-supporting. Thus a constant danger menaces society, and the need of a strong hand perpetually saving society and converting dictatorship into a regular form of government is kept always before it. As private individuals cannot certainly go on with this kind of benevolence without ruin, the labourer turns from the proprietor to the State as his protector and refuge, and the antagonism of property and labour is made more irreconcilable to the great advantage of the civil power.

Letter CXXXVI

Acton is opposed to taking notice of Cardinal Wiseman's attacks—Patience and "a duck's back" are the only safeguards for their principles

Aldenham, Wednesday [*August* 27, 1862].

. . . I am strongly against noticing the Cardinal. His attack on our narrative is a tissue of mistakes. Let us rather submit to an unjust accusation of error than subject him to a true accusation.

1. The tone has nothing whatever to do with it. The antagonism of principles is so enormous that it overwhelms all the lesser questions of disagreement. But our principles, method and objects are unchanged.

2. We cannot separate our *Rambler* from Newman's. Any surrender about the past must involve more or less the paper on "Consulting the Laity," which is, theologically, the most offending thing of all.

3. Newman's school, the future university (whether our own or at Oxford), and the whole interest of thought and science, are mixed up in our cause. In order to save them I am persuaded that patience and a duck's back are the only safeguards.

Letter CXXXVII

Acton's desire "to be left alone"—A proposed article on "Shropshire"

Aldenham, Friday [*October* 21, 1862].

. . . Waters is profoundly wrong. We don't want to quarrel with these good people, and don't want to hurt or weaken them—only to be left alone. Therefore, no sting and no fuss.

But I am very glad he is writing. We might have Salop for April. Does he want any notices? Has he got the histories of Ludlow, Shrewsbury and Bridgnorth? Has he read in Smiles's *Engineers* the life of the man who built the Ironbridge? Has he traced Charles II from Whiteladies to the Severn ford at Madeley? Has he read Baxter's autobiography for this part of the country? Dugdale, for Wenlock and Buildwas? The lives of the Clives and the Hills? Does he know the man who lived two hundred and seven years at Bridgnorth? That old man must do good service in founding the University. Has he read Blakeway's *Sheriffs of Shropshire?* and somebody's *All Round the Wrekin*, and a history of the foxhounds, to know about old Squire Forester? and has he got all the ghost stories about Acton Burnell?

Letter CXXXVIII

Renewed opposition from Bishop Ullathorne—The contents of "our model number"

Aldenham, Tuesday [*November* 25, 1862].

Your letter will be useful, and I will use it *en temps et lieu*. Bishop Ullathorne says that he hears he is to be ignored, so, as he has his hand in, he will just finish off another pamphlet* at once, so as to crush the Review. I don't know whether this will be against the *Home and Foreign* only—which would in some degree alter our position. If it is also against you, you ought to wait for it, I think, only keep your plans to yourself. . . I begin to think that "Three Generations" may stand over to April, to end our model number, which that is to be. You might then work a little at Events and Notices. For we stand thus:

Perin's Political Economy, Roscher; Irish University Education, Monsell; Material Revival of Spain, Albania; Colton; Three Recent Poets, O'Hagan; Classical Scholarship in England, Paley; Confessions of Frederick the Great, Ozanam; Stanhope's Life of Pitt, Capes; Christmas, Science and Industry, Sullivan. Four are in hand. Two are due next week.

I look forward to a grand April number, for which see below.

Proposed April number:

* A second published letter of Bishop Ullathorne's appeared, but at the same time a letter of Simpson's criticizing the first as to its facts and inferences had been printed and circulated.

Writers for the April Number

Volunteers, Wetherell; Land Question in Ireland, O'Hagan; The Teutonic Alliance, Frantz; Position of Austria, Price; Revolution in Greece, Finlay; Shropshire, Waters; Lyell on Antiquity of Man, Sullivan; Celtic Literature, Sullivan; The Waldenses, Döllinger; Mary Stuart, A[cton] and Weale; Art at the Exhibition, Pollen; Pythagoras, Acton; Three Generations, Simpson.

Besides other things by yourself, Renouf, Bloch, de Buck, Dentinger, Ryley (Marine Insurance) Monsell and many others.

If the Three Generations are postponed, then pray that notice of Husenbeth. Don't let us bid against each other at Tierney's sale.

Letter CXXXIX

Acton criticises Simpson's reply to attacks

Aldenham, Monday [*December* 9, 1862].

I could not get through your pamphlet in time to write by to-day's post, and I am afraid I shall be rather late. I strongly dissent from a very important part of it.

You end by a sort of appeal to Philip sober and to the Holy See. Now the first is only a charitable figure, but the second is, to my mind, an error. Under circumstances such as when the issue lies between the authority, veracity and theology of the whole hierarchy of England, supported already by Propaganda, and people obnoxious in the highest degree because of the Temporal Power, which is in Roman eyes a question of existence, I should think very poorly of the chance of

a verdict. (1) They do not deem themselves canonically bound to hear or to consult an obnoxious. (2) There is an enormous latitude for condemnation of what is offensive to pious ears, dangerous to the weak, open to misinterpretation, etc.

In this great point, therefore, you—in the pamphlet—and the *Home and Foreign* part company, and you can safely say that there is no combination between us in terms as strong as you like to use.

1863

Letter CXL

Simpson's "Three Generations"—Kinglake's "splendid, mischievous performance"—The April number

Aldenham, January 20, [1863].

I . . . trust you will complete the "Three Generations," down to 1851, for April. It will be of the greatest importance to have that article in the next number, if you can manage it. I cannot find anything of Plowden, but I will try to get you a pamphlet or two when I come to town.

Will it not be possible to get Waters' "Salop" for April? It would be very desirable, if you can bring any pressure to bear on him. April ought to be a model number. Of ten men who wrote sixty-three notices in January, I wrote thirty-one. This must be more equally divided; I beg of you do as many as you can conscientiously. If you are doing a light article, let not that prevent you.

I read most of Kinglake before it appeared. A splendid, mischievous performance, bottomed on much good political doctrine. It requires a showy article: shall not Capes write it?

See my dreams for April. Lord Stanhope has asked me to review him on "Human Sacrifice," so if I can do it he will talk about it.

Ultramontanism,* S[impson] and A[cton]; Past and Future of the Volunteers (Wetherell); Present Posi-

* In the *Home and Foreign* for July, 1863. In reality the article was Acton's.

tion of Parties (Price); Tenant Right (O'Hagan); Finances of the French Empire* (Bloch); Albania† (Arnold); The Art Exhibition of 1862 (Pollen); Lyell on Man‡ (Sullivan); Human Sacrifice (Acton); The Waldensian Forgeries (Döllinger); Kinglake's Invasion of the Crimea§ (Capes); Three Generations of English Catholics (Simpson). Also Waters on Salop, Monsell on Irish Politics, Sullivan on Celtic Lore, Capes on Pitt, Helfenstein on Medieval Education, Dentinger on German Philosophy, Renouf, etc., etc.

Letter CXLI

A naval contributor—A proposed article on "Ultramontanism"—Renouf on "Orientalism"

Aldenham [*January* 23, 1863].

Captain Hall on "Naval Discipline,"‖ by all means. Get him all official books and publications he may want, and encourage him in every way. Also in Coles's shield, etc., for July, an excellent idea. Nothing can be better than these two articles.

I will supply materials on Ultramontanism and you literature and wisdom. Duffus Hardy crops up from time to time. Will he ever do anything of any use to us?

Will you give me back those men whom you describe as the founders of our school in "Three Generations"? I want them for Ultramontanism, where I propose tracing the true and the spurious pedigrees. . . .

* Printed in April. † Printed in July. ‡ Ibid.
§ Printed in the April number.
‖ Printed in the April number (1863) as the first article.

Bergenroth would be the right man for us. I wish too we could get a scrap from Brewer. Don't let Volunteers (which must come in April) prevent the Captain from writing his two articles for July and October. Wetherell will easily, I should think, get him the admiralty papers.

Gladstone has not answered yet. Perhaps he is not in town. Renouf offers an April paper on Orientalism* in the early Church, with new light on Manichees and Gnostics.

Do I reckon on you for Greece, Russia, Egypt, France and Spain?

Letter CXLII

A gift to the Bollandists—Suarez and Christian politics—Manning's Radicalism

Aldenham, January 25 [1863].

Do you think the Bollandists would allow me to make them a handsome present of the Medieval series, published and to come? If you do, pray direct all that has appeared to go to them, and order the continuation in my name. Stewart will manage it, if you like. Let Paley have the *Speculum;* he will review it, and Stewart shall give us advertisements. Will not de Buck review de Rossi?

January 27.

Ward alludes to an article on the Roman States in March, 1860, and the passage he means is Vol. II, pp. 315-316. The allusion to Suarez refers chiefly to his *Defensio* against James I. The treatise *De Legibus*

* "Orientalism and Early Christianity" was printed in July, 1863.

is not quite in the same degree open to this objection. Ventura afterwards wrought out this system in his *Pouvoir Chrétien*, not always happily. Puffendorf quotes some writer who had died shortly before, I forget whom, and call him *beatus* so and so. Ventura sees this in Puffendorf, and without acknowledgement, pretending to have read the work referred to, cites *Le Bienheureux so and so* as an authority on his side.

Ward must settle the question with Manning, who agrees with Suarez, and alludes to this theory when he says that he is in reality a radical.

The most extreme development of Suarez's views is in Spedalieri, whose book is not very common, and who is a sanctimonious Tom Paine.

Will you suggest to Ward that a very good book has lately been published on the "Life and System of Suarez" by Werner, an Austrian theologian of note? If he has some German-reading friend who would review the book, and would add his own thoughts on Suarez, it would be interesting.

Letter CXLIII

Proposed article on the Catacombs—Pitra's elevation to the Cardinalate—Spurious acts of martyrs—An Irish contributor—Kinglake's *Crimea*

Aldenham, Thursday [*February* 12, 1863].

. . . As to the insertion of a treatise on the Corpi SS.—in the shape of a review of de Rossi—it would be so good an advertisement in ecclesiastical quarters that I think it deserves consideration. I will bring up my de Rossi for you, as I conclude that you

will not put the matter into Northcote's hands. As a review of the Inscriptions, there would be a favourable prejudice in the minds of readers, and de Rossi and his friends would puff it.

Pitra's elevation is really creditable, for he is as learned as such a man can be. The Solesmes people all believe in the spurious acts of martyrs, and think that Tillemont, Arnauld and Ruinart rejected them in a sort of heretical spirit. So they would of course multiply the number of martyrs by here and there an odd ten thousand. Döllinger's demolition of the Laurentian legend carries criticism a stage further than Mabillon.

Dunne, who is much in the confidence of every Irish bishop, but *testibus* Newman and Renouf a very clever fellow, offers literary and historical articles. I have dangled Bossuet's new works before him at a distance, and proposed Limerick at once. Lathbury is on Kinglake, and an illustrious Crimean hero has promised military criticisms. So it will be: "We can only say we saw nothing of the kind"—"We can appeal to every man present on the left wing whether we are not right in stating"—"No historian has yet done justice to," etc., etc.

Letter CXLIV

Acton proposes a article on "Epigrams"—Conversion of Lady Herbert of Lea

Half-moon Street, Monday [*March*, 2, 1863].

. . . I hope Beaumarchais is giving you the wish to do "Epigrams"* for July. It would be much

* Simpson's paper, "Epigrams," was printed in the July number.

wanted. If we have Volunteers and Convicts, which are timely, Poor Law, not being particularly timely, might come in October.

I believe there is no better thread for epigrams than philology; seeing how different languages and therefore the spirit of different nations adapted themselves to the constructions of pointed sayings: Greek, Latin, Italian, French, English and German. The beginning is, however, in the Sapiential books. They say that Lady Herbert of Lea has been received at Rome.

Letter CXLV

A restored Poland

Half-moon Street, Friday Morning [*March* 6, 1863].

I send you the *Daily Telegraphs* from the end of January. You will find all details about the Polish revolution in the field. Of course you have seen Montalembert in the *Correspondant.*

You have filled me with a misgiving about your doctrines. The conspirators of the emigration, who for many years have been getting up a movement, aim at independence, at a restored Poland, and as it would be Catholic and would deprive Austria of a great province, the French liberal Catholics of course desire it. But from the point of view of right, what is to be insisted on is the establishment of just government and gradual freedom there as everywhere else. National independence must not come into competition with this, or be preferred to it, as it is of course by all men of ambitious views, all democrats, believers in the sovereign

nationality, lovers of a Catholic power. There is no security for good government in a restored Poland, with the revolutionary party supreme, either in the principles of that party or in Polish traditions, or in the chance of union with Austrian and Prussian Poland. Now on the principle that arbitrary power must be put down we must think not of a restored Poland, but of a converted Czar. The wrongs of Russia are also very great, and only part of the work would be done by taking away Poland. The principle requires us to defend the Russians also. If we appeal to the treaties of 1815 as a security for the liberty of Poland, they are a security also against its restoration. The same claim the Poles have for the old, promised constitution secures Galicia to Austria and Posen to Prussia. It is not enough to stick up for that constitution. The evil is not that Poland is aggrieved, but that Petersburg oppresses. The claim of Poland to a constitution is not greater than the claim of Russia. *Seu vetus*, etc. The position of the Russians is not improved by taking away Poland, but the right to care for them is yielded up; and so the principle would be abandoned.

I do not see how we can be consistent if we urge a separation of Poland, or a restoration of the ancient territories, as true legitimate principles, if the revolution is to be justified by Russian despotism, and therefore on behalf of the Russians also. The crime that destroyed Venice was greater than that of the partition, for Poland was unable to preserve her independence without being a nuisance. The abomination of the last generation of her independence cannot be overestimated. Yet we do not wish Venice to be restored at

the expense of Austria or of Italy. We really cannot build up a right now on the basis of the iniquity of the Partition.

From a religious point of view, which will not do as a guide, but with which one ought to cover one's rear, the striving of Poland to be independent is a great evil for the Catholics of Russia, as it connects Catholicism with insubordination. But a reconciled Poland, self-governing, and carrying the necessity for self-government into Russia would give great support to Russian Catholics. I remember I saw nobody so earnestly opposed to Polish independence as the good Polish monks in Russia.

Your notice of Colenso will be of great importance. Pray do it carefully without allusions.

Letter CXLVI

Preparation for the next number of the *Home and Foreign*—Waterworth's report as to Bishop Brown's opinion of the Review—"There has never been anything so good in England"

Aldenham, Monday [*August ?* 1863].

I send you Scheret on "George Eliot" and Heine on "Shakespeare's Womankind." Heine is a man you ought to delight in. I know nothing of Lewes's "Comtism," and I have not got his *Biographical History of Philosophy*, of which there is a new edition in one volume. I hope your Eliot studies are getting on.* Frohschammer seems to have been delayed because I was expected at Munich. Here is what has been given

* Simpson's article on "George Eliot" appeared in the October number of the *Home and Foreign Review*.

or recently promised, for I have written to make sure: 4, Foundlings; 10, Dante's Commentators (at Robson's); 3, Poland, Buddeus; 5, Geography, Arnold; 6, George Eliot, Simpson; 11, Frohschammer; 12, University Education, Renouf; 8, Papst Fabeln, half finished; 1, Prison Rules and Ministers, Lathbury; 7, Primitive Myths, Paley; 2, Emigration, Moule; 9, Celtic Literature, Sullivan.

The Irish Church, Sir Thomas More, Federal Reform in Germany, Lowe on Gladstone's still unpublished speeches, are all uncertain.

Roberts only asks for time. New Zealand excellent. Childers on Victoria in January, Bowen on Queensland in April, and Weld on New Zealand in July would be well. Waterworth, a devoted friend and admirer, told me, in all secrecy, that the Bishop of Newport was overcome by our last number, and declared to him privately and at Spetchley quite openly, so that it might reach the ears of the bishop of that diocese, that there has never been anything so good in England, etc.

Letter CXLVII

The Bishop of Shrewsbury converted to the value of the *Home and Foreign*—Cardinal Cullen's organ has also an eulogy on the last number—Articles ready or promised for the next numbers

Aldenham, Tuesday [*Sept.* 9, 1863].

The Bishop of Shrewsbury, under pretence of making his visitation, has spent a week here for the purpose of demolishing the *Home and Foreign*. Wetherell,

Arnold and Roger Vaughan* came to meet him, and I have been too busy to do anything.

The time was not lost, however, for I converted the Bishop, who came to curse, and went away yesterday after giving his blessing to the Review and expressing himself gratified at my explanations, and satisfied with the principle *non lac sed escam.* At this moment he is at a great meeting at Sedgley Park, where he announced his intention of proclaiming his altered views. He assured me that in spite of the strong feelings of some bishops, a reaction has been setting in among them, and that he would try and promote it.

Pray take care not to over-use this fact in conversation. It will be best to let it work out its own effect, and not to provoke others to drive back the bishops. Arnold and Vaughan, to whom the Bishop opened his mind, will carry the matter.

At the same time, Cullen's organ has a flaming eulogy of the last number. The episcopal conference was diversified by the study of your article on "George Eliot," which is one of the most excellent things you have ever written. Even our stern critic was mollified and moved to frequent choking. I sent thirty pages to the printers to-day. He has carried off the rest to Malvern.

My review of Döllinger† has long been in the printers' hands, as also "Emigration,"‡ and Wetherell will

* At that time Cathedral Prior of the Benedictine House of Studies at Belmont, Herefordshire, and afterwards Archbishop of Sydney from 1877 till 1883. He died suddenly the night after his arrival in England on a visit, August 18, 1883.

† "Medieval Fables of the Popes," printed in the October *Home and Foreign.*

‡ "Emigration in the Nineteenth Century," by Moule, in the same.

send up Paley on the "Ancient Myths"* immediately. I read nine good but severe pages of Arnold on "English Boundaries," which will be original and soon ready. Lathbury is finishing "Prison Discipline,"† and I expect "Poland" daily. Renouf and Sullivan are postponed till January. The first I have not pressed, as an interval after "Manning" is not to be regretted. The latter could hardly come in the same number with "Dante," which cannot be put off. The materials on Frohschammer are very incomplete, and contain nothing about what has been done. I go to Munich on the 25th, and shall get all particulars for January. It is no use doing it now very imperfectly. . .

Materials abound for Mexico. You should look up Chevalier and one or two pamphlets spoken of in the newspapers. Let me know if you would like to look through France. After Mexico, turn for a moment to French internal affairs, the anti-episcopal edict, and so by an easy transition to the absence of all the French clergy from Malines, to the spirit of that assembly, the unexpected effect of Montalembert's speech, etc. The new *Correspondant* has an article on it.

I have your notices safe. Can you also do Chevalier, and Cousin's *History of Philosophy?* I am busy with the splendid new *Acta SS.*

For January we have: "Volunteers" (he is well and eager to do them); Lowe on "Gladstone";‡ The "Irish Church"; "Federal Reform in Germany"; "Foundlings"; "Browning's Poems" (Arnold); "Celtic Phi-

* "Classical Myths in Relation to the Antiquity of Man," in the number for January, 1864.

† "Gaol Discipline in England and Wales," printed in October, 1863.

‡ "Mr Gladstone's Financial Statements," in January, 1864.

lology"; "Sir Thomas More" (a charming letter from Brewer); "Frohschammer"; "Catholic University," etc.

Would it suggest itself to you to do Vinet for January? Besides the two little volumes, I can send you half a dozen exquisite works and a few criticisms. He is a portent in the history of Calvinism, and would be a capital subject for such a pen as yours. I have put the *Register* question into the hands of the Attorney General together with much good advice.

1864

Letter CXLVIII

Plan to secure writers for the *Review*—Father de Buck and M. Block named—Simpson's projected article on Shakespeare—Were the Sonnets early and written at one time?—Thackeray—His position as a critic, etc.—The suggested resemblance to Horace

Aldenham, Saturday [*January* 10, 1864].

. . . I would try, if I were you, to get some notices from de Buck, and especially one on St Dympna.

Block is so very sensible a man, and his politics are so sound, as I judge not only from his articles in his *Dictionnaire*, but especially from the notes with which he occasionally corrects a *digne confrère*, that I would not, if I were you, lose the chance of getting his notices on any books that interest him, more particularly on France, politics and economy. Laboulaye's book is very good indeed, but if he does not make certain drawbacks on his praise, I shall be in a fix.

I do not see why Judaism is an objection to a man writing current events. Block would go into details and give a real chronicle with very accurate knowledge. Renouf expects to get M. de Lincourt to write for us, who is a very remarkable personage and would be invaluable; but I do not anticipate that he will do Current Events. So if you will offer them to Block and undertake to give them an H. & F.-ical aspect, I think you cannot do better. By all means promise him a notice of his *Dictionary*, whenever he likes. If you don't write it yourself, I will, and the book deserves great praise.

Do you really think of two successive articles on Shakespeare? There would be many reasons of policy against it, and I should think internal objections, too. Would you prefer doing Shakespeare altogether for April, putting away Thackeray, and getting somebody (which is easy) to translate Block? I think the other arrangement would be better. Your article can be as long as ever you like, four sheets if necessary, and I am sure it will answer. Are you so sure all the Sonnets were written early? Nobody who is a real poet, sits down to write a hatful of sonnets; they are produced occasionally—in intervals, as it were, of business. Bodenstedt has arranged them in order by the resemblance of phrases, etc., to passages in his plays, and, though very vague, the plan struck me as plausible and ingenious.

Assuming that you care enough for Thackeray to do him, which nobody else is likely to attempt, I am sorry to say I have neither his books nor any good ideas about him. The former you must buy out of the public funds. I have a vision of a clever essay on him by Henri Taine in one of his volumes of essays. His views of history are surely very superficial, and he is not in the first rank of literary critics, but he can go to the bottom of small minds in a way which is wonderful, because he was not a first-rate judge of character among his acquaintances, and, therefore, often wanted tact. Lord Broughton dined with him, and there was a bottle of rare wine, of which one glass remained when all had partaken. Thackeray slapped the drunken old lord on the back, saying, "And this shall be for you, my good old friend." At which the other pulled a wry

face, as having a sore back, and because he thinks he is not old and knows he is not good, nor wishes to be thought so. Thackeray himself was extremely sensitive in the great world. I certainly did not think him *distingué*.

The marvel is how he knew the ladies of the great world so well, for that is his strongest department. *Esmond*, again and again I assure you, is a masterpiece for that sort of knowledge. Also, in *The Virginians*, the description of the growth of love in the two sisters for the two brothers. The old flirt in that book, Lady Maria, does not seem to be superior to Amelia Roper. Also, in *The Newcomes*, to the match-making mammas I could add a touch or two.

There are historians, like Thiers and Ranke, whose cleverness won't allow them to recognize the union of greatness and genius with goodness. Their great men are Richelieu, Frederick, Napoleon, without high moral virtue; and their good men are commonplace or else dupes. They require some compensation of this kind, and would be puzzled to draw the conventional Washington or Burke. There is a point to be made here for those who read and love the lives of the saints; and, as you will remember Thackeray's joke about the dictionary, perhaps he would deserve it. For he is very like those historians. I suppose more poetry would have raised him above this defect, for Dickens is without it, although he is so far below Thackeray in his characters.

The resemblance to Horace which one of the reviews suggested, may deserve following out. Is it not a fault in art to hold the mask in one's hand instead of on the face, to be constantly looking out from behind

it? To give him his place in literature, you must read *Tom Jones* and Thackeray's essay on Fielding. Is he not quite incapable of the great effort of art which is so common in Shakespeare, and which Dickens imitates, of putting the comic perpetually as a foil to the tragic? He rather relieves the comic by the colloquial.

There, I know it matters not whether one's ideas are true or false, if one can set you agoing. The fact is I know only *Vanity Fair* well. But you will find him often a congenial mind with your dining-out self. Arnold is recovering him of his illness, and will do his "Northumbria" in April. He seems to have been cured by the *Home and Foreign* for January.

Letter CXLIX

Question as to the dedication of the 1609 edition of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*—Thackeray hardly ever epic, but rather surgical—Trollope

Aldenham, Tuesday [*January* 12, 1864].

I am afraid I dare not, without book, involve myself in the difficulties you propose. Some of the points are, I remember, dealt with in Bodenstedt's Commentary, but I have not got the book. It is a little volume, 1862, well worth looking at.

I wonder how you reconcile the Dedication of 1609 with the idea that Shakespeare prepared the edition and is responsible for the arrangement.

The fate of Marlowe and others would confirm your interpretation of Sonnet 74. I can bring or rather send you Marlowe and Webster. I am not sure I have

any others. Also you shall have Ulrici, who, I presume, is not translated, in spite of his Protestantism. . .

Wednesday.

Pray stop the printing of Moule, and I will write unto him. It won't do to have a weak Taylor by the side of Thackeray. The latter is not objective, if that is what you mean, as a glance at his perpetual moralizing will show you. He is hardly ever epic, but rather surgical. A writer of the first order discovers the mode of action and thought of his own characters when once he has clearly conceived them, rather than invents. He does not sit down to consider, "How *shall* my hero act or speak under such circumstances?" but, "How *does* he?" Shakespeare *passim*, which is caricatured by your friend Balzac, who did not *give* names to his characters, but walked over Paris reading the names on shops till he found them. I don't think Thackeray ever got so far as this, unless in *Esmond*. I think Trollope does, and his glasses do not colour, but he does not profess to go so deep. Perhaps the slow and studious growth of Thackeray's powers contributed to this, or is connected with it. The Germans whom he studied would not raise him above this Euripidean method—nor probably any amount of mere labour.

But why do I talk? Have you not cheapened the original? . . .

Letter CL

Bacon's *Philosophy of Shakespeare*—Thackeray must not be judged without reading *Vanity Fair*, *Pendennis*, etc.—Some articles for the Review

Aldenham, Sunday [*Jan.* 24, 1864].

I suppose you know Bacon's *Philosophy of Shakespeare*, which I think is only an attack on his claim to be his own author. You shall have Swift in two volumes and any German in whom I can find anything humorous. You shall also have the new volume of the *Philobiblon* with Bohn's foolish life of Shakespeare.

You are putting Thackeray in his box before reading *Vanity Fair*, which is premature, and the picture of the great world in *Pendennis* and *The Newcomes* is true to a considerable degree.

I shall not come up probably for a fortnight, so write for books any time next week.

Do you think it would be possible to get through Block a Spanish "Current Events" for April? There are ministerial changes and new party arrangements of which we all know nothing at all. Talking of Spain, I have suggested an article on recent Spanish literature to MacCarthy, perhaps for July.

My friend Dease promises an Irish article for April, on "Emigration and Landlordism." I have already seen the bulk of it, and think him very sensible, honest and fluent.

Bonamy Price offers "Currency" for July. Renouf shirks the "Bible Dictionary" for fear of the Jews.

Newman's Sympathy

Goodwin, knocked down by the article on George Eliot, is anxious to write for us.

Letter CLI

The doctrines, etc., of the *Home and Foreign* not likely to triumph—Newman has great sympathy, but doesn't understand the theory—Urges Simpson to reply to Anglicanus in the *Times*

Aldenham, Sunday [*Feb.* 7, 1864].

I always warned people that there was no triumph in store for our doctrines, and that the authorities could never adopt them or sincerely admit us to be other than rogues. To this X. demurred very decidedly, I suppose because Newman dreams of a conversion in high places. Now Newman has great sympathy with our cause, inasmuch as he is enlightened and liberal and highly cultivated; but I do not believe he really understands our theory, and certainly would no more admit it than de Buck.

Wednesday.

Why don't you write an answer to Anglicanus in the *Times* (who is Arthur Stanley) and sign it Romanus, and show the way in which we have an advantage over Anglicans, and how far Döllinger's words can apply to them, and preach up H. and F.-dom?

Carleton is very provoking, for he carefully excludes the question which makes New Zealand interesting—the gradual formation of a free community.

Letter CLII

The story of Frohschammer's errors—His heresy on development—Sends Simpson the Brief condemning him—The rescript must be printed after the article

37 *Half-moon Street, Good Friday* [*March* 6, 1864].

I sent you the exordium yesterday. I now send all that remains to complete the story of Frohschammer down to the beginning of your story. I have taken pains to make his progress in error intelligible and, to be just, have separated the debatable part, much of which may be explained in two ways, from his pure heresy on Development. You will see at a glance what it is all about. I send the Brief condemning him, which goes farther in the direction of Rationalism than any papal act. Observe the words *Dei naturam*. Also my notes, when I meant to deal more at length with Frohschammer. I don't know whether any part of them will suggest anything to you worth inserting.

We must print the rescript against us (shall we call it a Brief?) after the article.

Letter CLIII

Sends Simpson a document which makes it impossible to carry on the *Home and Foreign*—Attitude of the writers in the Review to the papal rescript against Döllinger—Acton's wish to close the career of *Home and Foreign* at once

37 *Half-moon Street*, *Tuesday* [*March* 8, 1864].

I send you a document, received this evening, which will make it impossible for me to carry on the Review as hitherto with a good conscience.

The whole drift of the Papal rescript, beyond the direct attack on Döllinger, is to condemn the foremost principle of the *Home and Foreign*—one on which I believe there has never been any difference of opinion between us. Let me call your attention particularly to the passage in the second half of the first column on p. 49.

This is an elaborate statement of opinions and intentions on a point practically fundamental which are incompatible with our own. I, at least, entirely reject the view here stated. If it is accepted by the *Home and Foreign*, the Review loses its identity and the very breath of its nostrils. If it is rejected, and the proclamation of the Holy See defied, the Review cannot long escape condemnation, and cannot any longer efficiently profess to represent the true, authoritative Catholic opinion. In either case I think the Review forfeits the reason of its existence. It cannot sacrifice its traditions or surrender its representative character.

There is nothing new in the sentiments of the re-

script; but the open aggressive declaration and the will to enforce obedience are in reality new. This is what places us in flagrant contradiction with the government of the Church.

My wish is therefore to close the career of the *Home and Foreign* with the next number, and to do so with your full consent and approbation, but on my responsibility alone. The article on Lamennais and Frohschammer gives an opportunity of explaining in a peroration the motives of the step, and of defining once more the principles of the Review and of vindicating the Catholicity of its conductors.

I will draw this up separately, and will send it to you on Thursday, to be judged and interpreted with your usual kindness and handled with your usual freedom. If my impression of the probable consequences of this document do not seem to you justified by its language, I hope you will suspend your judgement till I have put together the grounds of my opinion. I will only say that, in reading the rescript, the maxim *restringenda odiosa* would not be a safe guide. Remember also the public effect this attack on the Munich Congress will have. Pray return the paper when mastered.

Letter CLIV

Is glad Simpson sees the importance of discontinuing the *Home and Foreign*—Will write the declaration of policy at once—Hopes that his literary partnership with Simpson is not at an end

37 *Half-moon Street* [*March* 10, 1864].

I am most grateful for your letter, because I take it as evidence that you see the thing in the same

light as I do, and are not making a concession to my scruples. In omitting all allusions to the two circumstances you speak of, the expense and the differences which have arisen, I was guided by no other motive but that of sincerely informing you of the true grounds of my intention—with which they had nothing to do.

As to the first, I have never been disturbed by it, because the object of our experiment deserved some sacrifice. As to the other matter I hope you know by this time that it no longer exists. . .

I cannot keep my promise of sending you the declaration to-day. I mean it to be as open and objective as possible. I shall write only for the purpose of making people clearly understand our motives, not in order to please, or to conciliate anybody; but I will give as little scandal, and say as little against Rome, as possible. Of course it must be made as clear as daylight that we do not accept these views on the subject. But I am unwilling to enter upon any part of the paper which may involve a defence of the Germans against whom it is directed—as nobody must be given an opportunity of attributing to them the same disagreement with Rome which we acknowledge. Keeping only this in mind, pray modify what I shall send you, give it all literary form compatible with my signing it, and return it to me to be copied out.

I hope our literary partnership is not at an end. It has often been in my mind that you had larger things to do than to write articles, and that the pressing need of the hour kept you from more important work. If you and Renouf turn your thoughts to the composition of serious books, you will do more for the lite-

rary character of the Catholic body than the *Home and Foreign* could ever have done. For my part I will take the most selfishly liberal advantage of your friendship to consult you about the political philosophy of Catholicism for which I have collected so much.

1866

Letter CLV*

Preparations for the publication of the *Chronicle*—Acton's advice to the editor, Mr Wetherell—How to secure the best writers—His high opinion of Father Stevenson—Recommends certain books of reference

Munich, Thursday night [*October*, 1866].

Your letter brings good news indeed, and you will have to compute how such wealth can be best made recuperative. If you can pay £3 an article, I should think that the best investment. But there will be some heavy expenditure, at first, on books, and then on correspondence. This is a matter on which it will not be possible not to waste some money in experiments. You cannot tell beforehand whether that proposed system will work and pay.

I saw Friedmann,† who was full of a letter of yours, sent to him by Bergenroth. He is very well off, and said he would be glad to pay for the admission of his articles, if he could not come out otherwise. It is possible, therefore, that you may spare your money as far as he is concerned. He cannot yet write English well —nor indeed can Bergenroth. But he is clever, sensible, ambitious, thoroughly trained in Prussian universities, and immensely learned on the period of Philip and Mary—between Bergenroth's period and Stevenson's. I suggested a paper on the spuriousness of the Memoirs

* This and the following Letters (Nos 155-169) were addressed to Mr Wetherell.

† Paul Friedmann, who is known as the author of the works on *Queen Mary* and on *Anne Boleyn* published in 1884, was recommended by Acton to Wetherell.

of Charles V, and he liked the idea, and will execute it if reminded. He will propose other essays of the same kind when you put yourself in closer relations with him.

Stevenson * is probably on the whole the best-informed of men living on every part of English history. I found him as deeply read in the later Stuart times as on the Anglo-Saxons. So I ought not to have made the proposal I did about Bergenroth's next volume. But I had a motive which was not mere presumption. I have read and discussed most of his [Bergenroth's] "Introduction"† with him, and it contains very strange things. There is no resisting Bergenroth's evidences with the materials of the bows and arrows period of historical knowledge. Now he is very hard on a Pope who had rare qualities, Adrian VI, and he praises the Epicurean Medicis who preceded and followed him. I discovered at Brighton the reason of this, and of a certain very refined and intangible sort of injustice in his idea of the Church, and I was anxious to point this out for his own as well as for the public benefit, in a way that might enlighten and could not repel him. Simpson says that Stevenson considers Bergenroth an evil-minded enemy of Catholicism. Nothing can be more unfair, and if the very grave provocation the "Introduction" will give is taken in an angry way, the

* Rev. Joseph Stevenson, born 1806; entered the MS. department in the British Museum in 1831; was incumbent of Leighton Buzzard 1849-62; projected the Rolls series of *Chronicles and Memorials;* became a Catholic 1863; was employed at the Vatican by the English Government in transcribing, etc.; became a Jesuit; died 1895.

† Bergenroth edited the *Letters, etc., relating to the Negotiations between England and Spain* (vols I and II, 1485-1525). The second volume appeared in 1866.

critic will not have the best of it, and Bergenroth will not understand the Church any better. Perhaps Stevenson might review the book (you bearing what I have just said in mind), and I might somewhat later write an article on Adrian, and the figure he cuts in Bergenroth's "Introduction." It will be well to keep the authors of critical articles quite secret, especially from the authors reviewed and their friends; otherwise you might have submitted the dilemma to Bergenroth himself.

Friedmann has offered an essay on the Loss of Calais to Lewes; * if not accepted, he spoke of breaking it up for you. I cannot tell whether that would be practicable. Gayangos † being what you say, it might be well to consult him on the choice of a Spaniard; rather than ask him to write. Bergenroth would know what sort of choice there would be. Gayangos possesses an admirable collection of historical MSS., which the misgoverned Museum will not buy. Perhaps an article might be made upon it, to draw attention, and promote the purchase.

Stevenson could write, or give matter for, an excellent article on the literary policy of the Government in the Rolls and other publications. He says there are most important medieval works that have been disregarded by the Commission, and should be published. But he will not offend Romilly.‡ I am fencing with that potentate concerning the Vatican, and have thriven so far; and he says he will consult me when the time

* George H. Lewes was then editing the *Fortnightly Review*.

† Don Pascual de Gayangos, who succeeded Bergenroth as editor of the *Spanish State Papers* for the Record Office.

‡ The Master of the Rolls, 1851-1873.

comes to choose a man for the mission; so that it may happen that the notabilities in Rome will be as numerous as the papers say.

Kaufmann probably knows all about the discontented Slavonic races in Austria, and all about the German press, if you should care for article or information about the spirit and inspiration of various journals. Cartwright* and Grant Duff know about people who go to Turkey.

I bought at Paris, and sent over, *L'Annuaire Encyclopédique*—a large half-yearly volume, with information for the first half of this year. It will reach you sooner or later, by devious paths. You should get Williams and Norgate to send for *Kellners Statistik*, 1866, a very useful new book, with all that can be told in figures of the various countries of the world. Remember that a German square mile = 21 English square miles.

I was not able to do anything for you at Paris. I know Broglie, in truth, hardly more than Simpson does. He is no doubt a superior man, and would be invaluable.

Block† will, however, be decidedly useful. He has more information than anybody about French administration, finance, trade, economy, and his views are sensible, but I am not sure whether he is behind the scenes of actual statecraft. You remember he was going to start a newspaper of his own; so he must be well up.

* William Cornwallis Cartwright, author of a work on *Papal Conclaves* and other books.

† Maurice Block, author of many works upon general and French politics. His chief work was a *Dictionnaire General de la Politique* written in collaboration with various statesmen and others.

He knows all sorts of writers, but it would require skilful handling to get him to press them into service. . . . Piot* is a friend of de Buck, and a sound Belgic historian, but him also I cannot judge in the light of the present. Is Stevenson's Douai friend Le Glay? He would do well.

Gardiner,† I should think, must be known to both Stevenson and Bergenroth. He would write very gravely on his times. In his book he glorifies Guido Fawkes and his friends. He has taken pains to get documents even from Munich. But perhaps Pinchart would do still better to review Motley's new volumes.

I think Grant Duff sent back Calvo, but am not sure. The Introduction is in the first volume, and he may have kept that one, but I don't know. See, on South America, the last *Annuaire des Deux Mondes*. It is an excellent annual register, but I am not sure whether there is a volume for the last year or two. It was always well up in South American affairs. It is a subject not to be neglected. Napoleon III is the only statesman in Europe who has taken interest in those countries—and understood them so as to have a policy about them, which is one of the best things in his reign. Wappäus, of Göttingen, in his new edition of Stein and Hörschelmann's *Geographie*, has taken great pains with South America. It may be a few years old, however. Daniel's *Geographie*, in the new edition, published last year and not yet complete as to Europe, is quite excellent. He is a crypto-Catholic, a friend of Döllinger's, and gives

*G. J. Charles Piot, the editor of the *Chroniques de Brabant et de Flandre*.

†Dr Samuel Rawson Gardiner, the first volumes of whose *History* had already appeared.

you a deal of political economy, philosophy of history, statistics, etc., in the shape of a handbook of geography.

The best book of reference I know of for recent political history is Wagener's *Staats und Gesellschafts-lexicon*, complete in twenty-one or twenty-two volumes. It is very interesting, full of the most recent and most intimate information, tinged with the *Kreuzzeitung* politics and religion of Stahl, Leo, etc. Both of these men wrote in it. *The Review* would do, I think, if followed by "of Politics and Literature" in small letters like the *Journal des Débats politiques et littéraires.*

Leone Levi ought on every account to write, but I don't know how he stands to the particular subject you speak of. When I get hold of Gladstone, I shall pump him.

Who knows all about military affairs? You ought to have some clear view for the reform of our detestable system. I don't believe that of the *Spectator* was practical.

Might not Gayangos, Dedecker and others write a good long letter to start with, and so give you a compass and chart?

There is no good large portrait of Döllinger. You shall have the autograph; meanwhile I send you the promised photograph. My wife has gone to St Martin, Ried, Haute Autriche, where I shall go this day week, and remain till the 16th. Then Venice till October 28; and then Hotel de Londres, Rome.

Letter CLVI

Germans do not subscribe to journals of others countries—Suggestions as to reviewers—Raleigh an excellent subject for Gardiner—Bryce, beside leading articles, ought to review much German literature

St Martin, October 17 [1866].

I do not anticipate success in getting an appreciable number of foreign subscribers, for in Germany, at least, people do not subscribe to foreign journals, but to libraries and reading rooms. You ought not to reckon on this. But I hope for better things in respect of books and perhaps of advertisements, and have written to the two first publishers in Southern Germany on the subject. Would not Block do the same for Didier, Lévy, Hachette and the principal Paris booksellers, and Pinchart at Brussels? I will see what can be done in Italy.

Should not Sullivan,* who is said to receive all the learned journals and transactions in Europe, occasionally give brief accounts of what he finds in them? It would not disfigure "Contemporary Literature," as a sort of supplement.

Friedmann is more at home abroad than in England; his studies incline to foreign policy, and he has probably never read Cranmer. The new volumes of Hook†

* William Kirby Sullivan, a professor at the Catholic University, Dublin, and author of *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* and of several learned articles and reviews in the *Home and Foreign* and elsewhere.

† *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.*

ought surely to be reviewed [by] Stevenson. Cranmer and Pole especially point that way.

Cartwright lived at Lady W. Russell's, 2 Audley Square, but was all day at the Athenæum. I don't know whether he went abroad, but he was not at Paris when I went there. At Lady William's they will forward letters to him.

The *Globe* military articles were renowned, I thought were by Siborne.* Get hold of the writer by all means, and of any friends of his who did not write in the *Globe*.

"German Universities" may be hung on the peg of the agitation for a Catholic University, a most characteristic dispute, which Renouf probably knows all about.

Remember that Bryce is on very friendly terms with Döllinger. He ought to review a good deal of German literature, besides leading articles.

"Raleigh" is an excellent subject for Gardiner. Pray send me the new volume of Fox,† as well as Bergenroth, but remember I have no books or notes to refer to in Rome. Would you mind, when directing Stewart to send the two books to Rome, adding Darling's *Cyclopædia?* ‡

I am not sure of finding Lord Clarendon—I saw him at Paris, but did not hear that he would be at Rome. Perhaps I may find Layard at Venice. But surely internal evidence will soon establish Kennedy's value, and it would be well to seize him—especially if nothing is got out of Edwin Norris.

* Herbert T. Siborne, who subsequently edited his father's *Waterloo Letters* in 1891.

† Probably the last volume of Lord John Russell's *Life and Times of C. J. Fox*, which appeared this year.

‡ James Darling's *Cyclopædia Bibliographica.*

My time is cut short, and I must keep my next letter for Bologna, where pray direct, Palazzo Marescalchi, till November 10. We go on Monday, through Tyrol, and I shall be at Venice alone for a few days, because of cholera. After November 10, Rome. By the time I get there I hope to have to report favourably about contributors. You do not speak of Ffoulkes having been adopted.

Why not a series of sharp articles at first on things to be reformed, errors and abuses in our State altogether —in the government of dependencies, of Ireland, of army and navy, in criminal law, poor law, prison law, local self-government, Church matters, nonconformity, etc., etc.? Done with care and with special knowledge, this should be a good *substratum.*

Letter CLVII

Education and the raising of the masses—Is going with Gladstone to Monte Casino—Has had great success in libraries and archives—The Cardinals call upon him as if he were an ambassador of a Catholic Power—The French flag was lowered on the Castle of St Angelo to-day (Dec. 10, 1866)—In a previous letter has over-rated the resisting power of the Papal army

Rome, Dec. 10 [1866].

. . . Compulsory education will be a great fight, but will destroy the presumption in favour of the State religion when it is really carried out. An important point of view is the saving in Poor Relief, which the raising of the masses and the disciplining of children ought to cause. But it will be a Revolution compared with which everything since 1560 has been child's

play. . . On Thursday I am going with Gladstone to Monte Casino.

My success in libraries and archives surpasses all expectation, and Cardinals frequent us as if we were an embassy from a new Catholic power.

Everything that I send you is of course submitted without reserve to your correcting and improving pen, and if you would let Renouf revise everything literary from me, I should feel sure of not leading you into mistakes.

The French flag is lowered on St Angelo to-day. I find reason to believe that I overrated the resisting power of the Papal troops in my notes. The artillery, *ultima ratio* in street fighting, will not fire on the people; and Cardinal di Pietro tells me that a barrel of napoleons and a cask of wine will settle the infantry of the line.

Argyll has arrived and Cardwell goes, without a single political observation or idea.

Letter CLVIII

William C. Cartwright will join in the new enterprise of the *Chronicle* as a writer—Attempted arrangement between Italy and Rome —The city perfectly tranquil—The Duke of Argyll will not go to see the Pope, as his son is to stand for a Scottish constituency— The Disraeli Reform Bill a chance for Simpson and Lambert

Rome, Dec. 17 [1866].

Cartwright is flattered at being asked to join, and has evidently hoped for the offer ever since Bergenroth told him of the scheme. He overflows with spontaneous promise. For Rome and Italy his means

of information are quite exceptional, and his letters will be valuable. He has no anti-Catholic propensity, but he sees every fact as it bears on his hopes and wishes, concerning which he is always sanguine. Both in Germany, in Italy and in America his ultimate theories are those of vulgar unitarianism. The department in which he has more rich thought is social science and associations of operatives. In personal judgements all his geese are swans, or at least all his specimens are types.

You shall have the last letter of Buddeus when I have answered it. It is the essence of three excellent articles, and not only shows but declares that he will work well with Frantz. He recommends Thaler more decidedly as correspondent for the secret history of Vienna and the Lower Danube. Perhaps it will be well to communicate with him. You have his direction in a previous letter of Buddeus. It would be well to allude to Buddeus and to the fact that Fröbel, his former colleague, wrote in the *Home and Foreign*, which he must know, as Fröbel mentions it in the preface to his last book. Thaler is desponding and Teutonic, the only qualities needing to be kept in mind when writing to him. I suppose you will only ask him for private letters, which you had better work into articles in London. You will judge of it better when you have read Buddeus's letter.

Tonello has had an indecisive, but not unpleasant audience of the Pope. Antonelli receives him with personal civility, but with taunts at the Italian Goverment. Probably both sides will wish to prolong negotiations. Rome is perfectly tranquil, but full of new

soldiers. The Jesuits are thought to be veering a little. Words of Curci were reported to the governatore as showing some disposition to get down from the high horse. Gualterio, prefect of Naples, the historian, has told my friend at the Vatican that they are resolved to strike a great blow at the Jesuits. It is still hoped that the Empress will come and prepare difficulties for the enemy.

Argyll will not go to the Vatican, because Lorne is to stand for a Scottish constituency.

Gladstone's illness has put off our visit to Monte Casino, whence Tosti writes me charming letters. We talk of going there after Christmas. Cardwell is off to Florence. He relies on Disraeli's unskilfulness to drive ministers to a dissolution in May. Robertson Gladstone said happily: "My brother William never looks out of the window."

Beware of mistakes in Cartwright's article on "Conclaves"* in the *North British*. I will prepare something on the subject either *à propos* of the article, or against a future conclave.

Will you go to Allen's, 12 Tavistock Row, and see if any books of mine are there which you can use? The *Annuaire Encyclopédique* ought to be there.

What an opening for Simpson and Lambert† a Disraeli Reform Bill will be! I suppose you have settled your newspapers. I send you some French statistics on the subject.

* Afterwards published separately in 1868.
† Afterwards Sir John Lambert.

1867

Letter CLIX

The appearance of the new journal—The name *Chronicle* pleases him —Sends an article—Mode of electing a Pope is altered by a Bull —The Presbyterian difficulty still goes on

January 25, 1867.

Your many friends in Rome have been getting anxious to hear about you, and I have sent no articles for fear they should grow obsolete before you appear. Last night Nardi gave me a number of the *Westminster Gazette*,* in which I see an announcement of the *Chronicle*, which is far the best name. I presume your first number will appear next Saturday, and so send you an article which strikes me as not unsuited for a beginning. I find that there is a Bull altering the mode of election, but not yet circulated, definitively, among the Cardinals. It is impossible to give a complete account of it, or even to say what I know. I have no doubt it substantially follows the utterly forgotten and unprinted acts of Pius VI, to which Cartwright alludes in the *North British*, but which nobody seems to know. I got them in MS. from among the papers of a dead Cardinal, together with those letters of Antonelli, from which, with a little help from Consalvi, I have put together my story. The only point that is quite obscure is the ultimate fate of the Bull *Attentis*. Antonelli got it signed in August, 1798. In October he says that the

* A Catholic weekly paper started by Mr E. S. Purcell with the approval of Archbishop Manning.

imprudence of his brethren made his plot fail, and wishes the Dean to get the Bull from the Pope. Morone (xv, 273) and Pistolesi, continuator of Novaes, say that it was a formal Bull, but do not appear to have seen it. The earlier Bull has never been mentioned. I have read it. The other I only know from Antonelli's analysis. Of course I want to insinuate that the recent act is described in the description of the old acts, and this is certain; but I cannot say so without violating a solemn seal of secrecy.

I should have sent you an article on the "Kirk and the Inquisition," but it is getting such an old story. As the Roman Government can be thoroughly justified, and there may be an opportunity, even so late, of speaking about it, I will send you all the facts to use as the state of feeling and knowledge in England may call for them. . .

Pray see whether in speaking of Panebianco I make a mistake in calling Clement XIV a Franciscan (Conventual), and correct me if necessary. I send another capital letter from Buddeus, which you will not want, as he seems to have written much to you. I am afraid the correspondence will be too great a drain on the money resources of the paper.

You will have good matter from Cartwright.

Letter CLX

Roman authorities not pleased with the *Westminster Gazette* defence —Reported retractation of Passaglia premature—Difficulty of financial arrangement between Church and State in Italy

[*About February* 1, 1867.]

I discovered yesterday that they are angry here at the defence of their policy in the *Westminster Gazette*, which raises very delicate questions.

So I thought you might like to have a statement of the facts and an outline of the defence which suggests itself on the spot. I fear it is much too late; if not, my notes, with much cooking, may serve as the basis of an article.

The report of Passaglia's retractation is premature. He has been going through "the exercises," and the Bishop of Mondovi has given hopes of his recantation or reconciliation. Nobody knows here what he ought to retract. You had better say nothing till you hear more about it from me.

You shall have an account of the finances of Rome in time for next week.

There is no probability of their accepting Scialoja's plan. Much turns on the question whether the property may be placed out of Italy, or the clergy, must become public creditors. In the latter case it is impossible to wish that they should accept it. As I see no papers, but pick up things orally, you must check all

I say by authentic documents, and there are so many wrong stories that I take some time to be sure of my facts.

Letter CLXI

The question of toleration in Rome is likely to be reopened—State of suspense in the city very great—Things more uneasy—The Mazzinists are active and the police not to be depended upon—Acton has visited some Roman prisons and finds them up to date

Thursday [? *Feb.* 22, 1867].

If not already published, pray keep the paper on the Secret Bull until you hear from me again.

You ought to send copies [of the *Chronicle*] generously at first to continental newspapers.

The toleration question is very likely to reopen, for it turns out that the recall of the American Minister and the abolition of his mission is in part due to the disgust caused by the Pope's meddling with their religious service; and Antonelli professes to believe that they are also worshipping in the Pantheon established outside the Porta del Popolo. When the mission disappears—it is not quite done yet—the Americans will have no *locus standi* within the walls, and will have to go the way of all unbelievers.

Things are getting more uneasy here. The Mazzinists are profiting by the intolerable prolongation of inactivity, and are not likely to remain quiet long. The Comitato wishes the monarchical Liberals to avoid the Corso during the Carnival, not only by way of demonstration but because the Red party is inclined to seize that moment for some act of violence. The Government and its organs would then throw the blame

on the Liberals, and arrest them, unless they had kept ostentatiously out of the way. The police are anxiously waiting for some opportunity of involving the Liberals in the blame and the doom deserved by the others. Therefore the Comitato cannot protect themselves by denouncing the Mazzinist emissaries to the Government. No notice is taken of the denunciation, and the papers carefully abstain from recognizing any difference between the Catholic and even Papal Liberals, the Italian patriots of the Royalist party, and the Mazzinists. The consequence is that persons notoriously of suspicious character, and known or held to be connected with Mazzini, walk not only at large but enjoy a sort of immunity, and even favour in high places. A very strange suspicion has been thereby engendered. It has become known that the Mazzinists, having held a conference some months ago at Bologna, then professed a wish that Randi might become Minister of Police, a post he now occupies. Some who knew him years ago affirm that, as a young man, he was associated with the Sect. I cannot speak positively of this suspicion of treason. I have heard it in more quarters than one, and on the very best authority as far as information and integrity go. But it must be remembered that a situation so enormous as this, where the Republicans are protected in order to swamp the Liberals, to spoil their game and prevent them from holding in hand the conduct of the people, is likely to give rise to extraordinary explanations. I would only speak of it now as a suspicion illustrating the peculiar position of things. Should it happen that Randi loses his post before very long, and that Mgr Lupi or some other

person succeeds him, you will understand what it means. And if you hear of some acts of violence during the Carnival, you may be sure that the Mazzinists have done it, in conspiracy, more or less, with the police, to ruin the common enemy, the Comitato, and that the Government will take advantage of it accordingly.

The crisis may come a little later, after the Italian elections, before the end of March, which is the term within which the new budget must pass. They must revive the scheme of spoliation; the Holy See will resist in spite of any modifications which may be adopted. Tonello is very likely then to be recalled, and then I do not see what more is to be waited for before an outbreak. The boldness of the brigands is increasing. They came lately into a place near Tivoli and *purchased* the food they wanted—a very ominous circumstance. There is not force to put them down. Kanzler, an honest, straightforward, quiet, but unhopeful man, reviewed his army yesterday. They look extremely well. Clark, Public Orator* of Cambridge, and Cartwright both counted, and made out about 4,000. But all the posts in the city were well manned during the review, so the garrison must be above 5,000. Theiner has just told me that he thinks all will be quiet till autumn. It is hardly possible. The emperor's speech is understood here as a renunciation of the personal obligation to the Pope—by all but the Pope himself; so the Revolutionists are more free than they thought. Fleury, at Florence, said that the emperor would send an army

* William George Clark, fellow of Trinity Coll., Cambridge, Public Orator (1857-1870), joint editor with Mr Aldis Wright of the Cambridge *Shakespeare;* died 1878.

to Rome if there should be an outbreak. Ricasoli replied, "Yes, but we shall occupy Rome together"; and Fleury replied nothing. The Italians can reach Rome in two marches. The military situation is this: the Pope has troops enough to hold Rome if they are faithful; but he cannot hold the city and the provinces. If he concentrates, the provinces will declare for independence; if he divides, the Romans can crush the Zouaves. For them, the joint occupation means deliverance. All this is so clear, except the amount of venality in the army, that the despondency of the friends of Government is growing very great. . .

The bishops named in the Consistory of to-day, or a very early day (I have not heard yet of its having been done), are the first positive fruit of Tonello's mission.

Yesterday I visited one of the great prisons with Sausse. We saw some cells really models of the kind, not yet occupied, and no sort of inhumanity. But there are grievous defects of system. I also saw the Good Shepherd prison, which is admirable in every respect.

I suppose plurality of votes means their multiplication by wealth, etc., which is untenable. If it means the right of giving all one's votes to one candidate, I do not understand the objection to it. It would make plumpers count two instead of one, and would make elections more amusing. Voting papers is, next to ballot and the punishment of bribery by imprisonment, the bulwark of the future constitution.

I hope to learn, by the spectacle of the paper itself, that you are going on well. Don't bore yourself with writing, unless you want me to do or say something in particular.

Generally I think it would be a help to correspondents abroad to have questions asked of them, and problems given them.

Letter CLXII

Dangerous state of Italy—Catholics are to stand aloof in the elections —In the event of the Government not getting a majority there will be serious trouble—The Italian Republicans are all *red*, and the priests will be made to pay in blood the penalty of past faults

Rome, February 25, 1867.

My news will be stale before you get my letter, but I am obliged to write secretly as things now are. Should the thing be still unknown, you might do well to send the substance of my letter, without the names, to Gladstone.

Ricasoli's circular contains an intelligible threat which meant that if the new Parliament is not as it should be, the absolute requirements of State policy must be met somehow. There is no hope of a favourable election. The organs of the Holy See distinctly announce that Catholics are, generally, to stand aloof, and let things take their doomed course. But without the Catholics a Catholic Parliament cannot be elected, and at this moment what the Government requires is a Parliament ready to carry out the engagements with Rome, and the principle of liberty, in compensation for the forced sale of property. The revolutionary party profits by the fix the ministers are in, and wishes to deprive the Church both of wealth and freedom, as the protest of the Left shows. Here they reckon on the ruin of the Italian State, and would not mind if

the Catholics helped the revolutionists at the election. The new bishops are so chosen as to be a declaration of war to Italy. A few, who are not violent, are dull. Others are men of parts, but violently opposed to the national movement. Probably, in the South, the Pope thought it right to come to an understanding with the King of Naples on the selection.

In the hopelessness of a successful election, the king has been advised to suspend the constitution. Ricasoli will make way, with his own consent, for the men who are to execute the *coup d'état*. . .

I am told that 40,000 men are at hand to keep Florence quiet. Men who are in the secret are not sure that there will not be a moment of mob rule in some towns. If the Republicans are kept or put down at Florence, Milan, Naples, Palermo, and the angry Piedmontese at Turin (Venice and Genoa being commanded by forts), I dread a recoil in Rome. Italian liberties will be suspended, for the immediate purpose of carrying out measures which are unpopular because they involve too great concessions to Rome. The Catholic interest is the first cause of the suppression, and a Catholic in evil odour is to be the chief actor in it. The unpopularity of the Church must be increased, and I see no prospect that the Catholic vote will be thrown into the scale presently, to sustain this new policy—or that those for whom the great risk is to be incurred will help those who are resolved to incur it. The Viscount calculates on the discredit into which the parliamentary *régime* has fallen, on the wish for administrative reforms which cannot be carried out as things now are, on the analogous

case of the late war, when all powers were concentrated in the king, for a purpose not more essential, on the personal popularity of the king, for his fidelity to the *statuto*. This of course is about to fail him. I cannot believe that he will succeed.

If my news is new, you might suggest the names, preferring them to certain others, but do not reveal them straightforwardly. The question between unity and liberty has come to a dreadful dilemma.

I fear that nearly all Italian Republicans are Red, and would make the priests pay in blood the penalty of their faults in the past.

What I have said I know for certain. There may be changes of persons or of counsels before the event.

Letter CLXIII

Question of Lord Granville's Premiership—Gladstone willing to serve under him—Suggests the name of a correspondent for Dutch affairs

Wednesday, February 27 [1867].

Here is a letter of no concern except to yourself.

In the autumn the Russells designed to hold an assembly of Whig leaders at Woburn. In making their list it occurred to them that in any discussion of Lord Russell's legacy there might be some jealousy or unpleasantness between Gladstone and Lord Granville. Brand saw Gladstone on the subject, and reported that Gladstone had expressed his perfect willingness to serve under Lord Granville's Premiership. Therefore there can hardly be any personal jealousy of Gladstone in Lord Granville's mind, or any disinclination to regard

the *Chronicle* as a common ally and friend. But some suspicion of his [Gladstone's] Radicalism is immortal in the minds of Brooksian Whigs.

Bunbury knows Watson, and I think that Simpson knows Bunbury—the Catholic ex-dragoon and Rosminian.

Letter CLXIV

Importance of getting able writers for the *Chronicle*—Suggestions of some more names: Wattenbach; Julius Ficker, Anton Grindely, etc.

Rome, Sunday [*?March* 11, 1867].

It is said that certain arrears to be paid by Italy, on their proportion of the debt, will reduce the papal deficit to O for this year. If this comes in time, pray insert this, as "It is believed," in the proper place. The heroic remedies will not, therefore, be tried yet.

Köchly, whom I believed to be at Zurich, is at Heidelberg. Pauli is no longer at Tübingen, but at Marburg, in Electoral Hesse, which is now Prussia.

As a general rule there can be no reason, I think, against trying to get all these men to write, if you can translate their papers. They are all sure to be flattered at being appreciated and solicited by an English Review. Should both Bursian and Köchly decline, I would try Professor Vischer of Basel. This is not the æsthetical man of Tübingen or Zurich, who was in Bruce's list; but a man who has written very little, but that little almost perfect, on Greek history. If written to, he should be called "Professor S. Vischer, Sr," for there is his son at the same University. I do not know that he is as

widely read as Bursian, or as well up in everything that appears.

For the Middle Ages, about the best man of all would be Wattenbach, of Heidelberg. He has written a book on the medieval chronicles down to the thirteenth century, which is a classic, and has edited some of them.

Waitz is out of the question; Pertz is too old; and Jaffé, I presume, too busy. It is for his literary, editorial, bibliographical knowledge, and for his perfect fairness that I mention Wattenbach. But Ficker, of Innsbrück, is as learned a man as any of these. He is a Catholic and still young; a man of Renouf's powers of work, fond of the tedious parts of historical inquiry, and not a finished writer; but decidedly in the first rank of learned men, and one of those who hardly ever make a mistake. If I was you, I would invite Ficker and Wattenbach both to review books on medieval history.

If you want a Frenchman for the same sort of literature, probably the most solid is Léopold Delisle, of the Bibliothèque Impériale. If he cannot write himself, he might be trusted to recommend some friend, capable of keeping you well up in French history down to the sixteenth century or even later.

From about 1570 to 1640 a certain [Anton] Grindely* has the sort of secret information that makes Bergenroth valuable. If he took to noticing books of that period, he would bring his hidden stores to bear. The Vienna Academy was to publish ten vols. of his *Inedita*. This and his life of Rodolph II might be alluded to. We were friends so long ago that he must have

*The historian of *The Thirty Years War*, etc.

forgotten me. He knows all about Bohemia and Moravia, and should be sought at Prague.

I have seen at last your neat advertisement in the *Saturday*, etc. You will soon find contributors multiply.

Pray prune away anything libellous in my notice of Crétineau-Joly. He is a great rogue, and I refreshed my memory by consulting Theiner, whom he libelled, before writing. I have no means of verifying about the Duke of Brunswick and Lord E. Fitzgerald, or about the death of Ducange in the notice of Rosa.

That third article of Scialoja's bill, which makes civil tribunals decide cases by canon law, gave the greatest offence both at Rome and among the Radicals. So it will surely go.

In speaking of the *coup d'état* play, which was, and is, so near adoption, one may say that the end must never be sacrificed to the means, or the substance (liberty and *right*) to the forms (*law*).

Letter CLXV

Congratulates Wetherell upon the *Chronicle*—Thinks some of the articles want "fun"—Buddeus speaks too strongly of the anti-Prussian tendency of the Catholic clergy—Stevenson is wrong about the Austrians not having taken much out of the Venetian archives

Wednesday [*March* 27, 1867].

Your note and the ghost * of the *Chronicle* came to-day. My congratulations are indeed most hearty. But I will begin with criticisms, as they alone are of any use.

* A rehearsal number, printed and privately circulated a week before the publication of No. 1.

"Current Events" ought to embrace more countries; but the reason for excluding Italy is excellent. A certain number of idle readers are caught by neat titles of articles; your titles are excessively sincere and matter-of-fact. There is some want of fun in the articles themselves, but that is what everybody has a better right to complain of than I have. Still, the French Commission and the National Debt are not light; though indeed the latter was as clear and easy reading as anything of the kind can be. I detect a slight trace of partiality in "Current Events," where, I suppose, Buddeus speaks of the anti-Prussian tendency of the Catholic clergy. To the surprise of everybody, the Bishop of Mentz—he is indeed a Prussian—has written a pamphlet decidedly unionistic, and there are parts of Döllinger's address which must be read in the same way. Ultimately, no doubt, there will be an Ultramontane opposition to the Protestant hegemony, but there is no prejudice of that sort among the others, so far as can be judged at a distance.

Stevenson is wrong about the Venetian archives. A good many things were taken away by the Austrians under various pretexts. In the treaty of peace their restitution was agreed, and Librario is to go to Vienna for them. Cérésole, a Swiss at Venice, wrote a pamphlet, in which the exact things taken away are catalogued. Then the photographs of Michael's despatches were finished when I was at Venice in October. They are wonderfully well done, and I should have thought must be in London at this time. Out of jealousy, I suppose, as it treads on my subjects, I thought the Venetian the least good article.

"Current Events," on Reform, are excellent, only too Gladstonian; and Lathbury's article strikes me as perfectly well written.

The article on Reform has only the defect of not appearing to be worked up carefully; but it is quite excellent, and, together with the German Constitution, gives you at once a very high place in politics. The Fenian article is better still, and I hope will appear in No. 1. Smith contains too much padding, although it is so very well written; and Catullus will put Paley on his mettle.

I think your literature will beat both the *Saturday* and the *Athenæum*. As soon as I have a little leisure, I will look out more books for Pearson and others. I will [do] that notice [of] Werner, though it is not pleasant to do a companion notice to Renouf's Dorner; and if he ends by doing Werner, put mine into the fire. Renouf had better do Döllinger; and if he has not done him when my article comes, I wish you would give it to him to manipulate.

Letter CLXVI

The first number of the *Chronicle* "surpasses all probability"—Rattazzi has been made minister—He is friendly to France but an enemy to the Church—Revolutionary proclamations in Rome

[*April* 6, 1867.]

Your first number surpasses all probability, and its one defect is that there are not articles enough. I will try not to be so very prolix another time, but my next article on "Ranke" will not show any signs of amendment. I think the way correspondence and news are

worked up in the "Current Events" is admirable. Gladstone must be grateful for the article on "Reform." The Russian article has not quite been brought to the tone of English reviews, and your Greek type is very small—which does not matter much.

I cannot tell yet what will be the consequence of Rattazzi's elevation. He is a much better debater and manager than Ricasoli, and on friendly terms with France, but an enemy of the Church. It will be a disappointment for Bismarck, I should think, but I see the papers say the contrary. Ricasoli wished for an alliance with Rattazzi, and it failed for reasons you will see in all the papers, and chiefly through the ambition of Rattazzi and Ricasoli's indifference to office.

Pray remember, whoever reviews Vizetelly, that the spuriousness of the disputed letters of Marie Antoinette is not an open question, but has been proved beyond all discussion.

There is an important German book for Renouf—*Katholik oder Ultramontan*, von L. Schmid. L. Schmid was professor of Catholic theology at Giessen, and was elected Bishop of Mentz in 1849. The Pope appointed Ketteler instead, who removed the theological faculty from Giessen to Mentz, and left his rival out in the cold. Schmid became a very vigorous enemy of the extreme school, and in the above-named book explains that he secedes from the Church without becoming a Protestant. . . I have no chance of ever seeing the book here; it is a capital opportunity for a very delicate article.

You must tell Newman how anxious I was to show him up, and how diligently you blocked up every opening.

Garibaldi and Revolution

Sunday night [*April* 7].

I have only just heard how prophetic your "Events" were: Menabrea-Castellani was to have been the ministry, and failed, it appears, yesterday. We also just hear of the warlike acts of Bismarck.

The recoil of Florentine complications has reached Rome. Yesterday a revolutionary proclamation was distributed, with a letter from Garibaldi accepting the lead of the Roman Revolution.

Let me have half a dozen copies here of No. 1, and of each following number, till I see my way to asking you to direct them to particular people. Odo Russell has made a dispatch to the F.O. enclosing the finance article.*

* Article on "Material Resources of the Papacy," *Chronicle*, March 30, 1867.

1869

Letter CLXVII

Suggestions as to writers and subjects for the *North British Review*—His own proposals

Aldenham, [*before May* 14, 1869].

The French Directory sent plenipotentiaries to treat for peace with Germany at Rastatt. As they were leaving the town, soldiers on horseback attacked them, killed two, and left the third for dead. Nobody has ever known for certain why or by whom the thing was done. I conjecture that Mendelssohn has discovered. Brie ought to review the book.

Grindely is not strong in general history. It would not be advantageous to set him to work on any times but 1580-1650, except in Bohemia and Moravia, which he knows during the whole Reformation period. He is professor of general history, and has probably written his Lehrbuch to save trouble in his lectures.

Roger de Belloguet is for Renouf or Sullivan. *Emile Burnouf* is a subject also of Renouf. I can hardly imagine his Greek literature being worth much.

Juventus Mundi [by Gladstone] is a sort of philosophy of history in the shape of a reconstruction of the Homeric age. I read much of it in MS. and kept my opinion to myself. It is gorgeous and original and paradoxical. Perhaps the best thing would be to put it, when it appears, in the hands of a great and generous scholar.

The Life of Sarpi [by Arabella Georgina Campbell], turns out to be complete rubbish, so that I can only short notice it. And the history of the Condés, by the Duc d'Aumale, passes over the event in almost complete silence, so that it would not be reasonable to append a discussion to it. The Duke is only worthy of a short notice. If therefore you wish for St Bartholomew, it must be undisguised.

Theiner sends me his book, asking me to review it, and to be particular in showing up the mendacity of Cardinal Consalvi. Pray add this to my notices. I don't know the title. He also promises me dispatches that I asked for out of the secret archives. Namely—in his continuation of Baronius are letters from the nuncio at Paris which allude to other previous letters, that are omitted. These omitted letters seem to be important for a minute inquiry into facts. In Mackintosh there is a fragment of another letter, which is omitted by Theiner. So that one is not at one's ease with the published dispatches, and I asked for the rest. He promises to send them. As I have a good deal of unpublished matter besides, it may yet be worth while to make a careful article on the subject.

I see Guicciardini's last volume appeared in 1867. I had already written to De Leva, suggesting this, Giordano Bruno and Zeller, and inquiring about his own third volume in a very friendly way.

Cosmo Innes is a great authority in Scottish history. I hope he will write about it.

. . . Madame de Peyronnet can write for Reeve as much as she likes. Why not try Duvergier, Rémusat, Laboulaye, *Lanfrey*, or Louis de Vielcastel? I would

begin with Lanfrey. He is certainly the author of a most excellent book on Napoleon. He has written one on the Popes, which I have sent for; it is too old for review, but would show all his line. He would also, probably, do reviews of French books, as, for instance, the next volumes of Vielcastel's *Restoration* and Duvergier's *Parliamentary Government in France*—books of the highest class. Lanfrey is only just making his way to celebrity, and is less established than Duvergier or Rémusat.

Delisle's *Catalogue* is not a catalogue, but a history like that lately published on the Bodley. It is very easy to review, and I shall be charmed to do it. Is *L'Homme qui rit* quite finished? I think it can wait December.

I must stay here till end of June, and shall be at Herrnsheim or Munich till end of August. My two articles and twelve notices will take me all that time.

Letter CLXVIII

On possible writers for the *North British*—Acton is willing to review *Raleigh* himself unless Gayangos will do it—Knows little of the old *North British* writers

Aldenham, May 21, 1869.

Frantz accepts in general terms, with a friendly allusion to *Chronicle* days. But his health is weak, and he is busy with a series of articles in Cotta's *Vierteljahrschrift* on political science. Four have already appeared, and he thinks well of them, and would like notice to be taken of them. He seems hardly prepared to write regular political articles just yet. But he will look through the books you mention with a view to

notice them. Only he has never seen a *North British*, and asks for the last number. It will have to be explained that you mean it to be a different thing.

I daresay the silence of Heidelberg is merely accidental. You might probe it by proposing another book to one of them, with an ingenious mention of your previous letter.

Droysen's *Gustaf Adolf* is in the list you sent me of my engagements, on April 29. I cannot find any definite release among your later letters. Remember that Frantz, to whom you do not seem to have offered it, gives no positive promise for the first number.

Ranke announces two distinct monographs, on the reigns of Rodolph and Mathias and on Wallenstein. They are not connected or consecutive works. Grindely has written a history of Rodolph, and Ranke will have to explain his attitude towards him.

I would give both Ranke and Droysen to Gardiner. The *Wallenstein* has certainly not yet appeared, though announced for this month, and Wallenstein is a more delicate topic than Rodolph and Mathias.

Raleigh is published by Macmillan, of whom you are sure to notice other books, and I am not properly competent, knowing nothing of the filibuster literature. If you care for a short notice, putting aside the critical matters on which the views of Edwards have already been checked by Gardiner, I don't mind trying, for I venerate that villainous adventurer for his ideas on political economy and universal history.

If Gayangos will do it, he would be the best man in Spain. He is a man of the world, who likes money, cards and ease; but he has immense knowledge of

books. They say he is idle, but if he likes to work he can be infinitely useful to you. I don't suppose Gayangos is a very zealous Christian.

Oxenham came into my mind by reason of a letter in which he asked me about Sarpi, whose biography he is to review in the *Saturday Review*, and finds Miss Campbell differing from the *Chronicle*. I hope I have given him the means of making an example of the book.

I find myself painfully unacquainted with the *North British* writers.

Professor Blackie is the one brilliant, paradoxical Scotsman, to be carefully prevented from reviewing the *Juventus Mundi*, on which, if he chooses, Simcox might make a splendid article.

J. H. Burton is an economist versed in the eighteenth century, for he is Hume's biographer; and in Scottish history, where he is, I suppose, the greatest master living.

Maziere Brady may make himself useful, though I suppose less so than Sigerson.*

Freeman is really a first-rate man, and knows about Federal Republics as well as about the Roman conquest. I don't know whether he and Pearson† are friends.

Forbes of Brechin might be made much of. Houghton is the Salop clergyman so lauded by Renouf for his Scripture zoology—a friend of Grant Duff.

Lounier, a laborious politician and historian.

Sterling, Hegel's alarming secretary.

Nicol, a conspicuous man of science.

* George Sigerson, M.D., author of *Modern Ireland* and *Land Tenure and Land Classes of Ireland.*

† C. H. Pearson, M.A. Oxon; sometime Professor of Modern History at King's College, London, and afterwards Minister of Education at Melbourne;

I suppose you will take an early opportunity of inviting as many of these men as seem worthy to work. It will be a dreadful load of correspondence, but such a blessing to have a great store of articles. Those who have 99* against their names on the list are responsible for a dull number.

Letter CLXIX

His article on the Massacre of St Bartholomew—A book on the Council is coming out which developes the ideas of articles in the *Allgemeine* erroneously attributed to Döllinger, to Pichler and to Huber—Would like to write an article on it—Gladstone has offered him a peerage

Herrnsheim, July 30, 1869.

I made a grave miscalculation when I expected to get St Bartholomew† into thirty pages. If I give ample extracts, and full discussion of the critical points, it will be at least forty pages. If you like, I can reduce it to thirty by omitting the longer extracts, and giving smooth results instead of minute argument. I would then print my new materials in full, in a French or German edition, a month or two later. At the same time, the value of my article depends chiefly on the singular force of the evidence, which can only be made clear by rather a full treatment. So that, in short, I apply for two and a half to three sheets. I am going to Munich for a few days; when I come back I hope to have the papers which Mignet gave my copyist.

author of *English History in the Fourteenth Century*, *National Life and Character*, etc. He contributed to the *Home and Foreign* and constantly to the *Chronicle* and *North British*.

* i.e., No. 99 of the *North British*.

† The article appeared in the *North British* for October, 1869.

The remainder of my letter must be secret to the last degree.

A book is just coming out on the Council, developing, on a very full scale, the ideas of those articles in the *Allgemeine* which were variously attributed to Döllinger, to Pichler and to Huber, but, as I find, erroneously.

I should very much like to write a short article upon it, or a very long notice, of say, seven or eight pages. It seems to me so important, that I shall probably write somewhere else, if you do not like the notion.

If you entertain the notion, let me know whether you prefer an article of twelve pages or a notice of eight, and whether you will leave me the option, as I find the book invites when it appears.

This is a more serious affair than the book on the Temporal Power, and the coming Council makes me anxious about it.

If you are pursuing the idea of an article on the House of Lords, it is well you should know that Gladstone does contemplate a moderate creation of peers, in spite of his victory. A peerage was offered to me on the day after the Lords yielded. I conjecture, but I do not know, that there will be at least a dozen. I need not repeat that these two facts must be kept quiet to ourselves.

Your answer will find me just returned from Munich.

1874

Letter CLXX*

Simpson's illness—Acton's expression of his indebtedness to Simpson's help

Aldenham, January 8, 1874.

Your letter has been the most welcome New Year's greeting I could have received after all the anxious accounts we had of your illness in the summer. I do most sincerely hope that the discipline you speak of is a salutary one, and that you are gaining strength surely, and without losing prudence. If the apprehensions of last September had been unfortunately realized, I should not only have had to bear the grief of all your friends but especially my own, for having never expressed, nor I fear shown, how great a part of the good things of many years of my life had come to me from your true and generous friendship, or how much reason I have had to thank God for it, and also for having been of so little help and comfort and edification to you in former troubles, for which it cannot be inopportune to ask your forgiveness. . .

* This and all the Letters that follow were written to Simpson.

Letter CLXXI

Gladstone's *Vaticanism* Pamphlet—Acton argues against its publication

Aldenham, November 4 [1874].

Pray consider what follows most secret, and discuss it only with your inmost self.

Ten days ago Gladstone wrote to me about his article on Ritualism, besides other things. In my answer I said that the reproach of Ultramontanism is too grave to be lightly addressed against any one without definite reason. He thought what I said just and suggestive, and asked to consult me about his next step. I went to him and found that he has written an elaborate and careful pamphlet, which amounts to this: You got emancipated by declaring yourselves good subjects and decent people in 1826. But you also declared, for the same purpose, that you disbelieved Infallibility. This declaration has become false. What proof have we the other is still true?

Assume that the evidence in support of this dilemma, of this challenge, is fairly and fully put. The result is to demand of the Catholics security against political Ultramontanism under pain of losing their claim to Liberal, to national respect and support—in reality, under pain of a tremendous No Popery cry.

Objections in detail were attended to, but to all political, spiritual and other obvious arguments against publication he was deaf. I ended by saying that though not one of those attacked, I was one of those challenged,

and that I should meet his challenge on my own account. I only obtained a promise that I shall see him again before he publishes. I want to have your views on this grave business. Do you think it right for me to reply? Do you see your way to a good reply? I have made a sketch, and have plenty to say. If I do prepare a letter to the *Times*, I shall be anxious to bring it to Clapham and talk it over with you.

Letter CLXXII

The Vatican decrees—Archbishop Manning's correspondence with Acton—Meaning of the word *submission*—Telegram to Simpson with reply

Aldenham, Tuesday [*Nov.*, 1874].

. . . Manning writes amiably as to my answer to his first question and the suppressed letter. But he knows not what I mean to be taken as the answer to the second: "Unless you intend to describe yourself as one of 'those who adopt a less severe and more conciliatory construction' of those decrees. If I am right in this inference, I would still ask you to enable me to understand what that construction is. . . Let me be able to reassure the minds of a multitude who," etc., etc.

You see, of course, the opening. I think of saying that I did not answer a question there seemed to be no occasion to ask, but that I must resist the inference he draws from my letter to him, as I really have no interpretation of my own, but am content to wait the construction of others, in absolute reliance on God's providence in the government of His Church, etc.

The great question is, whether I ought to say that I

submit to the acts of this, as of other Councils, without difficulty or examination (meaning that I feel no need of harmonizing and reconciling what the Church herself has not yet had time to reconcile and to harmonize), or ought not the word *submit* to be avoided, as easily misunderstood?

I mean to be very short, to save the old ground of his having no business here, to deal only with the meaning applied by him to my words about conciliatory construction, and to meet that, in ten lines, so fully as perhaps to meet the difficulty.

Telegram from Acton to Simpson [*Nov.* 17, 1874].

He [Manning] repeats question, and asks what my conciliatory construction is. This is a new start. Shall I take the opening he gives me and say with reference to this special question that I submit to this and all other acts of Church authority without difficulty, having no private construction of my own, but confidently waiting the interpretation of others? Please answer fully by return of post.

[On this Simpson suggested the following reply to the Archbishop:]

I published a letter in your diocese on which you took occasion to ask me two questions:

Whether I had a schismatical intent in it?

Whether I believed certain doctrines?

The first question I answered, because I considered you had some right to the assurance. The second I did not answer, because I did not acknowledge, and do not

now acknowledge, your right to ask it. The same questions were afterwards put to me by my own bishop, and I at once satisfied him on both points, as you know, and might therefore rightly conclude that I do not reject, but on the contrary receive *ex animo* the Vatican definition.

Thus it is within your knowledge, though you personally have no explicit statement of the second point from me, that I have given to the two parties who had a right to ask me severally, satisfactory answers to both the questions on which you sought information. You know both by my explicit declaration to you of my intention and meaning and by what you have learned from my bishop, that my letters to the *Times* had no reference whatever to the Vatican definition, which God forbid that I should contradict.

Therefore you know that whatever scandal has arisen from my letter or letters, to the effect that the writer of them does not receive the Vatican definition, proceeds from false assumptions and misunderstandings, which ought to have been scattered to the winds by the declaration prefixed to my second letter in the *Times*. After so many public and private declarations no one has any right to conclude that my letters emanate from a mind that rejects a doctrine with which they have nothing to do.

If it could be shown that any passage in my letters contradicts or is inconsistent with the definition, or if any passage can be pointed out that is otherwise heretical, I will at once retract and modify it and express my sorrow for it.

If it can be shown that any reasonable scandal has

been founded on any passages of any of my letters, I will seize the opportunity of explaining myself when I know what these passages are, and what sinister meaning has been attributed to them. But I repeat, apart from all defects of style and tone, which I am ready to acknowledge and deplore, I do not believe that there is a sentence in my letters which any ingenuity can twist into an heretical meaning. And in this view I am strengthened by observing that Father Newman has, in his reply to Gladstone, made use of many of the same facts, without thereby incurring the slightest suspicion against his orthodoxy.

Letter CLXXIII

Manning's further questions as to Acton's attitude towards the Vatican decrees—Position of Acton's own bishop

Aldenham, December 3, 1874.

Manning asks whether my letter means that I adhere, etc., repeating his question and sending me his pastoral.

Meantime, I have had a correspondence with my bishop, who is very angry, but admits that nothing I have said touches the Council, and that I have shown that I so understood it.

My first letter to him was rather strong. The second, after his explanation that he admits the principle of telling no lies, very civil.

Now, how do you think, in again telling Manning that his question is not justified and will not be answered, I can employ the testimony of my own bishop?

"My explanation referred only to a suggested interpretation of a passage in my letter to him. I meant to say that no such question could be admitted to arise from my letter to Gladstone, confirmed in this view by the fact that that is not questioned by my bishop. I should regret if that was not, on consideration, also his opinion."

Pray suggest what occurs to you, and say how far I ought to hint that my own bishop is most to the purpose. I want your answer by return of post, if possible.

Letter CLXXIV

The Vatican decrees—Question of Acton's attitude—He does not reject the Council—His real position

Aldenham [*December* 10, 1874.]

My bishop, getting angry at last, asks me whether I reject the decrees or accept them.

Please to consider this formula. The question is *motivé* by the unsatisfactory nature of my letters to him, inasmuch as I said it is a pity to be a liar, and at last wrote him a very civil answer indeed. So that it is not *motivé* at all. Besides, he has admitted that in public I said nothing heterodox.

Is not his case so weak that it ought to be resisted? I cannot admit questioning on that ground. I should gain nothing if I did, as the same thing would begin again. Dr Green has written to a local paper to say that I never, even virtually, attacked the Council. He is my confessor, and so has some claim to an assurance.

I have thought of writing to thank him for his letter, and then saying to him everything I can say or should say in the confessional if questioned, namely,

I do not reject—which is all the Council requires under its extreme sanctions.

As the bishops, who are my guides, have accepted the decrees, so have I.

They are a law to me as much as those of Trent, not from any private interpretation, but from the authority from which they come.

The difficulties about reconciling them with tradition, which seem so strong to others, do not disturb me, a layman, whose business it is not to explain theological questions, and who leaves that to his betters.

The bishop then, in refusing me the Sacraments, would be doing it solely on the ground of my refusal to be questioned *à propos* of my letters by one who admits their orthodoxy, not at all on the ground of heterodoxy.

Please to think all this over. I will try, if I can, to see you between 4.30 and 5 o'clock to-morrow, Friday, unless you send a message to the Athenæum to say that the hour will not do.

Gladstone writes: "I agreed with *every word* of R.S. till I came to 'G. should own himself mistaken, like a man.' But it seems to me that I am exactly right. I put 13 to illustrate 14. I complain of 14, and simply because it condemns civil marriage as *per se* null and void, or, as the Pope calls it in his marvellous speeches, *un concubinato*. I manifestly cannot confess an error which I do not see."

Certain serious Italians want to prefix a short statement, from a truly Catholic point of view, to a translation of Gladstone's appeal. He passes it on to me. I cannot do it; shall I not pass it on to you?

Gladstone also sends me a long correspondence with Coleridge, which I advise him to send to you, on the point treated in your letter. You are quite right, that I cannot ask the bishop for a certificate of consistency. But do you mean, because he could refuse it? If you do, my letter must be misleading. It was suggested that the word "inconsistent" might imply assent, and so I said that if any word *contradicted* the doctrines, it was against my real meaning, and must be blotted out. If you have a misgiving, let me know. I could still explain myself to the bishop, without danger, as to consistency with my letter.

Letter CLXXV

Acton and his Bishop—More questions as to Acton's real attitude

Aldenham [*December* 12, 1874].

My bishop's answer to my note asking in what way I was to interpret his former letter—as he did not seem quite consistent with himself—is moderate, friendly, does not actually repeat his question, does not resent my last, and distinctly prefers the milder interpretation, without sacrificing his solemn duties, etc. He says it is all to be considered a privileged communication—as if he thought I was ready to say more to him than to the public. In this there may lurk a snare. But it is evident that he does not want to force a quarrel.

One element in considering it is that it was written after a special visit of Dr Green to Shrewsbury, Dr Green being as well disposed as one can be when shocked, and preferring probably to end his days here in peace.

Letter CLXXVI

Gladstone's appeal not to be met by denial—The Vatican Council capable of "a Catholic explanation"—Attack not on the Council, but on Ultramontanism—Acton claims that his letters were perfectly orthodox

Aldenham December 18, 1874.

I have followed your suggestion, and here is the result. . . . What I want people to understand is this:—Gladstone's appeal could not be met by denying that political consequences could be drawn from the Council, or that any interpretation of that sort could be right or authentic. My reply to him was that, as an English statesman, he exaggerated the practical danger, and that his way of imputing to Catholics all the consequences constructively involved in the Decrees admitted of a *reductio ad absurdum*. Avoiding everything that might seem to trench on the present system, such as Inquisition and Liguorian ethics, I chose my instances from an order of things that is quite bygone and inoperative. This enabled me to give truth its due by bringing out the fact that Gladstone had not darkened the dark side of the question, whilst adhering to my view that the Council did not so directly deal with those matters as to exclude a Catholic explanation, or so that no authentic gloss or explanation could ever put those perilous consequences definitely out of the way. For I could not take my stand, for good or evil, as an interpreter of the Decrees, without risk of authoritative contradiction.

Although this was no attack on the Council, it was an attack on Ultramontanism; and although I carefully

distinguished the system I attacked from the Decrees, which I declared harmless in these matters, it was at once assumed that a statement of facts derogatory to the Popes must amount to a statement of opinion inconsistent with the Council. Therefore, in my second letter, I stated that the facts I dealt with were undogmatic and could not involve any collision with authority. When Manning asserted the contrary, I not only disclaimed the intention, but showed that it would have vitiated my whole argument. Having given him this explanation, besides what I said in public, I was obliged to decline the dogmatic question, which my letter did not raise, and which belonged to my diocesan. When my own diocesan then raised the question, I proved to him that my letters were perfectly orthodox; that I did not at all dissociate myself from the bishops of the minority, or disobey the Apostolic Constitution, or incur any anathema; and that my argument was directed against a totally different point, namely, the theory that it is not well to let history or the truth be known. I told him that if a single word in my public or private letters contradicted this declaration, I would blot it out.

The bishop admitted that there was no such contradiction, and, without admitting the truth or propriety of my letter, declared himself quite satisfied as to the Catholicity of the position I have taken up.

It would also be right to point out that a misquotation contained in my letter to the *Times* was corrected as soon as it was pointed out; and that one of the bishops having expressed doubts about my account of Fénelon, I showed, without determining the guilt or innocence of Fénelon, that I had not touched that question.

1875

Letter CLXXVII

Archbishop Manning and Acton—Acton has not attacked or rejected the Council—Rome may require some answer—Simpson's suggestion for a reply

Aldenham, January 6 [1875].

Manning, in a letter which you will receive with my comments enclosing it, says he must leave the thing in the hands of the Pope, as everybody tells him I don't believe the Vatican Council. He means, it seems to me, that he simply asks Rome to excommunicate me—a thing really almost without example, and incredible in the case of a man who has not attacked the Council, who declares that he has not, and that the Council is his law, though private interpretations are not, whose Diocesan has, after inquiry, pronounced him exempt from all anathema.

If he meant some further application, he would have said so.

Still the action of Rome may not be peremptory and final, but they may ask me for some further declaration. If that should be, it may be best to write such an answer as I could then appeal to. Pray think it over, against the afternoon post. If you will write to-morrow, I shall have your letter here on Friday morning. If not, then I hope to find your answer on Friday afternoon at Brown's Hotel, 22 Dover Street, W.

[*Simpson's Suggestion for Acton's Answer, Jan.*, 1875.]

You have now a right to state your own case and to demand that the statement should go with the other papers to Rome.

Simpson's Suggestions

1. You published your letter in the London *Times*.

2. Manning thereupon asked you two questions: (*a*) your intention in the letter; (*b*) your private belief.

3. You distinguished his right and authority as having published the letter in his diocese. You (*a*) disclaimed all schismatical meaning in the letter; (*b*) evaded all reply to the second, since he, not being your diocesan, had no right to ask it.

4. Manning professed himself glad to receive the reply (*a*), but insisted on an answer to his second question.

5. Meanwhile you had satisfied your own bishop as to your orthodoxy.

6. Manning having ascertained this, begins with a new charge, that you have given public scandal in his diocese, and must publicly retract it.

7. Your reply to this might be:

(1) You have publicly, in your second letter to the *Times*, repudiated the only explanation of your letter which could justly give scandal.

(2) That if scandal still exists, it is either reasonable or unreasonable. If the former, let the passages be produced on which the reason is founded, and you will either explain them, or if necessary retract them.

(3) But having had it already acknowledged by Manning that he believed you had no schismatical intent in the letter, and having satisfied your own bishop and other theologians that your letters do not in any way attack the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, it is absurd to ask you so to confess that doctrine as by that confession to repair any alleged scandal arising from your letters. Reparation of scandal can only be

given by a reply exactly corresponding to the scandal. To utilize an alleged scandal to demand an explanation already owned to have nothing to do with the matter whence the scandal arises is illogical, unjust, and a false pretence.

You therefore proceed to demand

(4) What are the passages in your letter (No. 1) which are not covered by your general disclaimer in letter No. 2, and from which the scandal is said to arise, viz., that they are inconsistent with your belief in Infallibility.

Letter CLXXVIII

Manning is wrong as to the sense of Acton's letter and his reception of the "definition"

Thomas's Hotel, Berkeley Square, Jan. 16 [1875].

Here is more light thrown on the matter. I thought of saying to Manning that he would do well to remind them at Rome that he was wrong on both the points he raised:—the sense of my letter, and my reception of the definition. Wetherell also thinks it would be well to point out that he now confines himself to my letter, which I have already explained to him, and which he does not attempt to pick a hole in, or to connect with disbelief in Infallibility. *

* Mr Simpson, to whom most of these letters were addressed, in the few last years of his life devoted himself mostly to his Shakespearean studies. He suffered much from the disease which finally carried him off on April 5, 1876, at the Villa Sciarra, the residence of his friend, Count Heritz, outside the walls of Rome.

CONCLUSION

THE correspondence, that extends over the best years of Lord Acton's life, presenting him in his most characteristic moods and testifying to his most enduring friendships, here ends at a seemingly critical moment. This cessation, however, carries with it no portent. To the controversies of that period the passage of time has given a just proportion; and when, years later, endeavouring to rally all Catholic forces to the service of the Church, Manning's successor invited Lord Acton to address the company gathered together for the laying of the foundation-stone of Westminster Cathedral, the occasion was further marked by an interchange of letters between Cardinal Vaughan and Lord Acton, bearing witness to the permanence of the good understanding effected. What was said of Newman on his becoming Cardinal might be repeated in local measure of this great layman when called upon to speak for and to his fellow-Catholics: "The highest authority in the Church now set the seal of approbation upon him—the clouds of past years had cleared away." Acton, too, in face of a selection seemingly "out of place with all my antecedents," might have added with the Cardinal in his own degree: "I had passed through many trials, and they were over; and now the end of all things had almost come to me, and I was at peace." To Lord Acton the end came on June 19, 1902. He died at Tegernsee, his home in Bavaria, fortified by the rites of the Church.

Letters of Lord Acton

It was said of Sir Robert Peel by Disraeli that he was the greatest member of Parliament that ever lived. If a corresponding generality were permitted, it would be safe to assert of Lord Acton that he was the greatest editor. Few readers of these Letters but will rid themselves of prevalent opinions as to the ease with which a serious magazine may be conducted, or as to the levity with which grave articles are put into print. Probably no Minister of State ever performed his duties more conscientiously than Acton his as essayist or reviewer; none in any department of affairs could give to the details of his office a more anxious attention, a more exhaustive care.

The familiar praise of Acton as "the most erudite man of his generation," if unattested by any volume all his own, receives abundant illustration in these Letters. For this reason they have been printed in a detail which sometimes serves little purpose beyond that of giving completion to the picture and exactitude to its setting. The alacrity of such a man to devote a life of labour and learning to apparently transitory tasks, with little reward beyond the approval of his own literary and historical conscience, since the praise of contemporaries—Matthew Arnold's even—hardly came into count with him, sets a standard for all those who create or control serial literature, and robs of half its terrors the prophecy of Lamartine that the periodical must sooner or later supersede the book.

GEORGE ALLEN CLVI CHARING
CROSS ROAD LONDON WC
BURNS AND OATES LTD
XXVIII ORCHARD
STREET W

1906

All Rights Reserved

Demy 8vo, 537 pages, price 12s.
Post free to cash buyers for 9s. 6d.

Edmund Campion

By

RICHARD SIMPSON

THIS standard life of the Protomartyr of the English Jesuits, the merits of which Dr Döllinger and Lord Acton were the first to recognize, has been declared by an historian of the succeeding generation (Abbot Gasquet) to contain the best account of the position of Catholics in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

"Richard Simpson, born 1820, graduated from Oriel College, Oxford, in 1843, and the next year became Vicar of Mitcham, Surrey. In 1845 he became a Catholic. He died April 5, 1876, aged 56. 'Edmund Campion' originally appeared in the *Rambler*. It is a most important contribution to the religious history of the sixteenth century."—*Gillow's Bibliographical Dictionary.*

"An admirable and exhaustive work" (*See Memoir of Simpson in the Dictionary of National Biography*).